

Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara

BY

J S SPEYER

Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam

FIFTH EDITION,

NIEUWE REEKS

Deel VIII N°. 6

W

AMSTERDAM

JOHANNIS MÜLLER

Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara

BY

J S SPEYER

Verhandelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam

AFDEELING I ETTERKUNDE.

NIFUWE REEKS

Deel VIII N^o 5.

AMSTERDAM,
JOHANNES MÜLLER

CONTENTS.

	Pages
Introductory Chapter	1—8

SECTION THE FIRST

Brhathatla and Kallusaritsugara

Chapter I	The Brhathathamamamam	9
Chapter II	The Brhathakatha Its contents	27
Chapter III	The Brhathakatha Its date and its author	41

SECTION II

The Text of the Kallusaritsugara

Chapter I	The two editions	61
§ 1	General comparison of the editions of Brockhaus and of Durgaprasad	61
§ 2	Errors and mistakes in Brockhaus' edition	67
§ 3	Corrections of Kallus words and expressions to be made in the Metropolitan Dictionary	76
§ 4	Grammatical monstra removed	87
§ 5	D's edition not a critical edition	91
Chapter II	List of passages the text of which has been improved in Durgaprasad's edition	94
Chapter III	Conjectural criticism	104
Chapter IV	Metrorium con pectus	174

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

In days of joy when Çiva the Lord of the Universe was alone with his beloved wife the daughter of Himavant, and caressed her she asked him to tell her some charming new tale for Indian gods and goddesses are as fond of tales as Indian men and women. The Supreme God however reluctantly and after an unsuccessful expedient to acquit himself with little entered upon a story of immense length and of an extraordinary charm. Püvati wishing to keep the whole of the pleasure to be procured by that wonderful extent of tales to herself shut the door and ordered Nandin Çiva's bull to withhold any person whatsoever from coming in. In the meanwhile one of Çiva's most beloved Ganas Puspikanti his name went on to see his master. Being forbidden the entrance he succeeded by dint of magic power to penetrate unseen within the presence of Çiva and Püvati and to overhear that new and delightful story about the seven sovereigns of the Anspits (Vidyadhivas). Full as he was of the great tale he had heard he afterwards narrated it to his own wife Jivati for who can hide wealth or a secret from women? She again told it over to her mistress the wife of Çiva for how can women be expected to restrain their speech? So it happened that Püvati knew the disclosure of the Great Narration notwithstanding the precautions taken to keep it secret and in her wrath she caused the indiscreet Gani to be born as a man. Mihavant another Gani, who interceded for his guilty friend was in a similar manner damned to a human existence. She fixed however a limit to the punishment. When you, Puspikanti will meet in the forest with a Piqua whose name is Kanabhati and who is properly a Yaksa brought to the state of Piqua by a curse of Kubera you will remember the whole tale then you must narrate it to

him, after which you shall be released. As to Mahavant, he shall get free from the curse after hearing the tale from Kāṇabhūti.' Accordingly both fell down from on high and were born in the world of men. And having spent their lives with various things, they fulfilled it last and after many vicissitudes the conditions prescribed to them and so regained the upper regions and their former state. But Mahavant or rather Gaṇadhara — for that was his name on earth and in his human existence — having heard the tale as it was narrated to him by Kāṇabhūti could not recover his original state before he had written it down and proclaimed it. Now, since the language in which it had been communicated to him was the vulgar and despised Pūṣṭa tongue, Kāṇabhūti being a Pūṣṭa and since himself was prohibited to translate it into some nobler dialect inasmuch as he was by a vow from the use of Sanskrit, Prakrit and either Apabhraṃśa or the conversational language of the country (*dhī*)¹, six sevenths of the wondrous narration were lost from want of human audience to catch the tale and keep it. He had no other listeners than the forest animals and the trees on which being he spent his recital, burning each leaf of the text after proclaiming. Finally King Śatavahana whose minister Gaṇadhara had formerly been, being requested to lay hold on the tale went up to him and preserved the rest for mankind even this a poem of considerable size, as it extended over 100 000 śloka.

This is the marvellous origin of that rich and splendid storehouse of manifold stories preserved to us in a Sanskrit redaction the Kathasaritsagara as is narrated in its first book, The Source of the Tale. Somadeva the Kāśmīran court poet to whom we are indebted for that largest and most interesting collection of tales is with due right considered one of the most illustrious Indian poets. And for my part I dare say that he is one of the few Indian literary geniuses who by their relative simplicity of language their moderation in the employment of rhetorical requisites their aiming at clearness and appropriateness of style their knowledge of human nature and their art of arranging the plot of a tale may stand out the judgment of European critics in accordance to the standard of Occidental literature. Though he lived as late as the second part of the eleventh century I do not hesitate to

make him rank with the greatest Sanskrit authors and to place his *Encyclopedia of tales* (for so his 'Ocean of the Streams of Story' is characterized the best) as a classical work next to the lyric poems and dramatic writings of Kalidasa. His language charms by its purity and the proper choice of words, his style by its plainness and elegance his metrical skill is great and is fully displayed by the number and variety of the different metres which he handles with ease and without the slightest embarrassment.

Apart from the beautiful form of the poem its contents are of great interest. This store house of tales may have been built at a comparatively recent time the very eve of the Mohammedan conquest the stories and legends gathered up in it are old ones. The *Bihār Kathā* its source preceded it by many centuries. And this older collection must also have been made up out of traditional materials. It is a matter of fact that some smaller collections, as the *Purāṇa tantra* and the *Vetśāpameyana*, are incorporated into it now and then the reader meets with some mythological narration from the Vedic age¹⁾ or with celebrated epic and purāṇik stories, as that of Cibi and the dove (tir 7 85—97) of Rama and the water snake (tir 11 76—87) of Sunda and Urasunda (tir 15, 135—140) of the birth of Śaṇḍa (tir 21 60 foll.) of the death of Pāṇḍu (tir 21 20—27) the love story of Uśa and Anuruddha (tir 31 11—33) and the extensive relation of the tale of Nala and Damayanti (36 238—417). In other portions of the book legends of the Buddhists are often reproduced especially in *lambkā VI*. The main story however and a large number of the episodes are Śaiva tales as was to be expected from the supposed first narrator being no other than the Supreme God Śiva himself. From this we may infer that the original collection, the *Bihār Kathā*, must have been arranged in that period of Indian history when Buddhism exercised its sway over the Hindoo mind side by side with Śaivism and so many other manifold varieties of sectarian and local creeds, rites and theosophies.

Moreover Somadeva wiled himself of the opportunities afforded by the richness and the many-sidedness of his subject matter to represent as in a mirror the different shades and aspects of multiform Indian society its huge towns the seats of commerce and learning as well as the wild tracks of its forest regions inhabited by ferocious and uncivilized tribes, as described in the vivid picture in tir 102,

¹⁾ As Uśa's love making with Alakṣ (17, 177—187), his beguiling of Narmuci (216—219), the latter tale however is dressed in a Buddhist garb.

56 foll In this respect the Kathavimutagara — besides its being an arsenal of more or less ancient tales of great value for the comparative study of fancy and folklore and for the transmutation of fables and novels — depicts also to the student of the Indian world the image of medieval Indian society, its customs and its worldlings its everyday life and its feasts its ruling classes and its scum

Nevertheless only few of the tales are of the pure novelistic kind Such stories as that of the impostors Citra and Madhava, who played a foul trick to a wealthy purohita (21—52—200) and of the *jala* and *Ala* tricks (57, 51—175) which are wholly free from the supernatural beings and things so habitual to works of Indian fancy are seldom met with In the great bulk of the tales there is large room for deities and spirits of the most various kinds and for secret and invisible powers of holy men or sorcerers influencing the course of the facts In short the Kathavimutagara is an assemblage of fairy tales Devas Asuras Nagas Yaksa Rakshasas etc but most of all the Vidvadhvas abound in them the magic arts the intuitive omniscience obtained by men possessing marvellous powers their flying through the air and commanding of spirits their transformation of men into animals and moreover the hideous occult rites of magicians and witches as well as divine intercession and divine protection are dealt with as if they were the most natural things in the world Somadeva who was a well educated man and possessed a keen intellect and an original wit as sufficiently appears from many an incidental utterance and general remark with which he likes to intersperse his narrative ¹⁾ succeeded very well in keeping undisturbedly from the beginning to the end of his long poem that style of epic ingenuousness which affords a so great charm to that kind of writings Now and then he reminds of Ovid by some humorous turn but he was not so superficial as the author of the *Metamorphoseon libri* He composed his great work for the amusement of the old queen his patroness the wife of king Harsa of Kalmere ²⁾ It is hardly necessary to add that his belief in the reality of those numerous tales however be it with god and spirits of high regard in the creed of the Indian people cannot have been much greater than ours!

As I have stated above Gunadhara is the reputed author of the

¹⁾ W. 11 p. 10. "We may here observe once for all that the stories of the Kath. Sarit. Samh. are constantly interspersed with the maximum of sentimentality."
²⁾ Cf. J. E. B. S. 101. "As all of the Kath. Sarit. Samh. are not of the same age, it is not likely that the Kath. Sarit. Samh. is a single work."
 p. 101. "The Kath. Sarit. Samh. is a single work."

Great Tale But his authorship cannot of course be extended to the first of the eighteen cantos or *lambakas* of which it is made up The first lambaka treats of the origin of the Great Tale and how it was made known on earth It is King Satravahana who is credited for this After having got the Tale says Somadeva Satravahana went to compose the Kathapitha [so is the name of lambaka I] in the same tongue [viz the Pāṇini dialect] fol 8 37 1)

The plan of the work is conformable to Indian habits of story telling It consists of a frame tale in which a large number of various other tales are stored up by the way of episodes Sometimes the episodic narration may be itself a new frame tale with respect to other stories Some books as the Vth one is a whole inserted into the main story This design is executed with greater or lesser skill Upon the whole the art of enchainment is not so well executed in the latter books, where some old famous collections of tales as the Panchatantra the adventures of Meghadatta and his ten companions, the Vetulapancavimuti are embodied in full the last lambaka the story of Visnuvardhana the conqueror of the barbarians looks as if it were a latter addition to a ready made work

The frame tale is concerned with the *facts et gestes* of Namiyadatta who was the son of Udayana king of Vatsa and at the same time the new embodiment of Kama who had become Ananga (bodiless) by the fire of the wrath of Citra Born as the son of a human king, he reached by degrees the high and heavenly state of a Calavartin of the Arya Spirits the Vidyadharas I lambaka II and III are preparatory books They treat of his forefathers and more especially of his father the merry Udayana king of Vatsa the musical prince who is mentioned in Panchatantra by the name of Anuvatsa a well known figure both in Indian *ballad* and in the Buddhist records where he ranks among the kings contemporary with Gilvumani (Rhys Davids *Buddhist India* p 3 foll) It is related by what continuance he got the love and the hand of Visvadvati who was to become Namiyadatta's mother daughter to the Ujjain king Candimara and in what way he succeeded to obtain for his second wife Padmavati daughter of the mighty Magadha king finally how his great chief minister Yaugandhiyayana made him acquire the sovereignty over the earth

) Here I differ from Tawney's translation where it is *lambakant rakum cakre* is rendered "so per el the book na el Kathapitha in order to show how the tale came to be first made known in the Pāṇini to give The instrument is to be construed with rakum is not with a *atara*

In lambaka IV Naravāhan's birth is told and the predictions of his future greatness.

Lambaka VI, which contains many and various pleasing stories taken for a great deal from Buddhist sources, is devoted to the history of Kalīngasenī whose daughter is destined to become Naravāhanadatta's first queen. She loved Udayana, but could not be married to him. Some Vidyādharā made her his wife by surprise, assuming the figure of that king. As the son of Udayana is an avatāra of Kṛṣṇa, so it is Rati herself who is embodied into the daughter of Kalīngasenī.¹⁾ Therefore, it is a matter of course that the two royal children become in due time husband and wife.

At this point of the tale, the main story begins to lose its interest. Udayana, the joyous monarch of the *dhīra lalita* type (see *Lavis Theatre indien*, p. 64) is evidently a popular hero of old local legend.²⁾ He is a man of action and his performances are manifold. He and his ministers and comrades Vāngandharyana, the wise plotter and strenuous executor of political schemes, Rumanant the victorious commander of his armies, and Vasantaka the companion of his pleasures and the solace in his adversity are typical characters with individual features belonging to popular tradition. But Naravāhanadatta, his ministers and the endless series of his wives, the obtaining of whom is the chief subject of the other lambakas and the main object of his exploits do not possess that stamp of peoplehood origin. They are rather the result of the mechanically elaborated reproduction of the fixed type of the Cakravartin and his court projected in *Itav* I and *Alvās* the like meetings of the son of Udayana with heavenly women who are destined to become his wives, always the same or nearly the same course of events, leading to the happy union with those princesses in whose superhuman powers he gets gradually initiated being in this way accustomed to take his residence among the Vidyādhars and becoming capable to conquer at last the Sovereignty in that Nephelokokkiazia among the snowclad heights of holy Kailāsa. This series of similar feats and adventures, in performing which our hero like another Vāngirān Aśvatas, plays a

¹⁾ Or rather she was thought so by every one. The real child of Kalīngasena was a son whom Prajāpati however according to the order of Śiva exchanged for a girl of supernatural birth (अजो यः) who was no other than Rati. See *Kathās* I 31 43-46 f 110, 71. The real child Itakā was conceived by her the Vidyādhara, who brought him up.

²⁾ With one less syllable 191 n. 2 after the text 31 f 1 e Me lādāta 1 aṇḍa jha nā t la jana dattakā ślagrā a pīṭha.

somewhat passive part as he is throughout directed by the protecting hand of deities and even by Īṣa himself, would be very monotonous, if it stood alone. But just here the frame story mostly recedes behind the numerous and diversified incidental stories so that the monotony of the so called main tale dwindles away in the background. Book XIV—XVI contain the triumph of the hero, the narrative of his wars and heroic performances by which he won that sovereignty of the Vidyadhars long promised to him. He was, however, not the first among mortals to reach that paramount power in the regions bordering on Īṣa's precincts: others before him had come to it. Two entire books, the Vth and the VIIIth are filled with the narrative of the exploits of two predecessors: the former Lumbika is a small fairy tale in itself of no little charm: the latter makes up a remarkable epic poem, celebrating the glory of the Asuras when victorious over the Devas.

H. H. Wilson was the first European scholar, who drew the attention of Occidental learning to this Storehouse of Fables. In an introductory article in the *Oriental Quarterly Magazine* (March 1821, p. 63—77) and continuing his communications in the following numbers of that periodical he gave a summary of the contents of Lumbika I—V.¹⁾ It was professor BROCKHAUS who undertook the first edition of the Kathasamhitam. Its first part appeared as early as 1839: it contains the same five Lumbikas which had been told over by Wilson. More than twenty five years elapsed before he succeeded to get out the rest of the work. Lumbika VI—VIII appeared in 1862: the remainder being by far the greater portion of the whole — 12589 slokas against 8799 contained in the first and second parts — was edited in 1866, both publications making part of the *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* and printed with Roman types, whereas the first volume Lumb. I—V had been edited in native types. The text of Brockhaus remained for a long time the work of reference for the Kathasamhitam but its authority is now superseded by the edition of DECEAUVILLE, printed at the Mimamsa Press (1st impression 1889: second imp. 1903) which has been executed in a laudable manner, as will be shown in Chapter I § 1 of Section II of this treatise.

An excellent translation of the work appeared in 1880—1884

¹⁾ These papers are reprinted in WILSON'S PAPERS collected and edited by F. B. ROY in 1864. They are found in the first volume (= Vol. III of WILSON'S WORKS) p. 156—263.

in the *Bibliotheca Indica*. Mr C. H. TANNIA, to whom we are indebted for it, acquitted himself of the self-imposed duty of rendering into English a work of that extent and of so high intrinsic merits in a very satisfactory manner. He has well provided those who without acquaintance with Sanskrit for their studies in folklore and comparative history of literature want to draw the Indian parallels or prototypes from their genuine source.

I for my part do not enter here upon the comparison of the numberless tales told in our Ocean of Streams of Tale. The present investigations do not go beyond the limits of Indology. They wholly belong to the field of critical and philological research. I have divided them into two sections. The former of them is devoted to the question pertaining to the *Bṛhatkatha*; in the second section the differences of the text in the two editions of the *Kathasarit-sagara* and some points of criticism are dealt with.

SECTION I

BĪHATKATHĀ AND KATHASARISŪGARĀ

CHAPTER I

THE BĪHATKATHAMĀÑJALI

As Somadeva explicitly affirms, his great store-house of tales and stories of all kind is not a composition of his own invention nor is it a compilation from various sources but a Sanskritization of an older and more extensive poem written in a vulgar dialect. He says in the introductory verses of his work that it is the reproduction in a condensed shape of the Bīhātkaṭhā the fabulous origin of which is narrated in its particulars in his first *lambaka*, the Kāthapūṭhā. He has nothing added to its contents nor has he omitted anything *yathā mūlān tathā vācān na manogopyatīkramah* (t. 1-10) he has only abridged it and made a Sanskrit poem of it *gṛhṇāstīśārasamśepamūlīam bhāṣa ca bhīṣate* ¹⁾, taking care besides to embellish his epitome with the indispensable adornments required in a kāvya yet in this going only as far as was compatible with his main purpose to keep intact the relish of the tales narrated in the old poem ²⁾. So he had the right to style his work a *Bīhātkaṭhasarīsāgriha* (Summary of the quintessence of Bīhātkaṭhā) as he does in the beginning of his poem t. 1, 3 *Bīhātkaṭhīyāḥ sarāsya sāgriham racayamy aham*, and in one of the concluding verses which we want in the ed. of Brockhaus but are found in that of Durgaprasād, p. 597, cl. 12

*nīmakathamītamayasya Bīhātkaṭhāyāḥ
sarāsya sājanamanambudhijīvanāndīh
Somaṣa vipīnārabhūṣaṇabhūṣa-
Rāṣṭrajena vīṭitah klāṣa sāgrihaḥ 'giri*

¹⁾ I quote this line, as it is edited in Durgaprasād's edition. The alt. red. t. at aqul Brockhaus *bhāṣa ca vīṣate* may further be left aside. Nor is it clear we can take here *īṣa* = Sanskrit in the line in question of the work as Hall did (see footnote of Salinellus *īṣa* t. 1-21 n) in his edition of the work and erroneous translation of this line by Brockhaus.

²⁾ More about this śloka see below, t. 11 cl. 11

Now as long as no other testimony was known, that is, until 1859 very distinguished scholars did believe the real existence of such a voluminous work in a Prākṛit dialect, as the Brhatkathā was claimed for. Could the Kashmiri composer of the Kathāritsāgarā not have fancied that origin of his work which by itself is an encyclopædia of products of fancy? Must his statement be taken *à la lettre*? A statement moreover, susceptible to find little credit also on the ground that the tale narrated about the reputed author of that famous Brhatkathā himself Guṇadhara is full of unhistorical matter and marvellous incidents in short a mere fairy tale. The first editor of the Kathāritsāgarā went even so far in the way of mistrust that in the Preface of the first volume of his edition which was published in 1839 he explained the distinct avowal of Somadeva about the abstruse of his poem in a sense diametrically opposed to the words he pretended to comment upon.

Sein Verdienst beruht wohl hauptsächlich in der gleichmässig stilistischen Redaction des früher unter mancherlei Formen in Prosa und Versen Zerstreuten. In the subsequent volumes which appeared in 1866 and 1868 he did not repeat that view.

Yet he might have learned as early as 1859 that Somadeva's statement about the Brhatkathā had been corroborated by other evidence. In that year Fitz EDWARD HALL in the Preface to his edition of Subandhu's romance in prose Vāṇavatī, drew the attention to the fact unobserved before that such high authorities as Dandin in his Kāvya-dūṣaḥ Bhaṭṭa in his Hrasavāṇī, and already Subandhu himself prior to Bhaṭṭa knew and praised the great Prākṛit poem of Guṇadhara and that according to the manner in which they refer to it we may feel convinced that it enjoyed a great popularity in their time. A passage in Subandhu's romance contains even an allusion to a story told in the Brhatkathā which is actually found in our Kathāritsāgarā P. 110 *asti Brhatkathā laṅkāyā na c' labhāyikopetaiḥ vāc' labhāyā pa' obhātāi* *Kuṣu* *may' rāṇi* Subandhu comparing the houses of Pataliputra adorned with columns bearing the shape of human figures (*śilabāyikā*) to the canto of the Brhatkathā in which *śilabāyikā* is likewise met with alludes to the story of the gambler Munthikāṇḍa and his beloved Kāṇḍā the *Apārā* who was changed by Indra's curse into a pillar statue (*śilabāyikā*) but recovered her proper form by the cunning of her lover (Kathā 121 72—186) ¹⁾

¹⁾ Hall II p. 90 writing his Preface at a time when only five of the eighteen *laṅkā*s of Kathāritsāgarā had been published errs in the interpretation of *śilabāyikā* as

In 1871, A C BURNELL, in a letter to *The Academy*, written at Tanjore July 21 and printed in the number of 15 Sept of that periodical, brought to notice that he had discovered a MS of another Sanskrit redaction of the Bihatkatha different from that of Somadeva. This turns out he wrote, to be almost identical in matter with the Kathasaritsagara. The tales are almost the same even in the names the arrangement (as far as I have been able to examine the MSS) is much the same but the style is not so good. The tales are told in a very bald way and shorter than in the K S S though here and there one finds long and tedious descriptions. This first hint was followed in the next year by the masterly article of G BERNIER in the first Volume of the *Indian Antiquary* (p 302 foll) in this he gave an account of another MS of the same work the Bihatkathamangyana of Ksemendra which he had acquired for the Government of Bombay. He established the following important facts: 1st that both Somadeva and Ksemendra worked on the same text 2nd that they composed their poems independently from one another. From some discrepancies in the names for the rest common to both he drew arguments to prove the correctness of the statement of both abbreviators as to the original Bihatkatha being composed in Pura. His judgment about the character of the poem of Ksemendra agreed with that of Bunnell. His brevity makes him unintelligible and his style is far from being easy and flowing (I I p 304). After comparing with each other the story of Putrika as told by Somadeva in the 3 of the Kathas and by Ksemendra in the 2^d gaccha of his lambhaka I he concludes thus:

I could easily add a dozen other instances where particulars given in the Kathasaritsagara are *hinted at* but not *helped* in the Bihatkatha (I I p 305) (p also his *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS* (1877) p 17).

In order to demonstrate his views Buhler had published in the paper quoted a few passages from the first lambhaka of the Bihatkathamangyana especially the story of Upalo. It was not till 1881 that other portions were put under the press. SURYANATH edited the first lambhaka (or lambhaka) 1st in full in the *Journal Asiatique* of Nov—Dec of that year and in a subsequent article in the number of Feb—Apr 1886 also the first and second Vaidika

) Bih spellings are full it seems in the manuscript. Buhler I I p 307 n 1 quotes from fol 319 a c of the MS *the Mahabharata* 1st ep I I p 11 (1st II) p 10 but cf Bombay p 311 *the Mahabharata* 1st ep I I p 11 (1st II) p 10 the passage of Suranatha dealing with Bihatkatha 1st apparently the name of the sections of the original is called Bihatkatha.

tale. He used for that purpose both MSS then available in Europe that required by Bühler (B) and a copy of that which Burnell had detected (A) for the Vetula tales he added himself also of a third MS, likewise required by Bühler and belonging to the Pooná library (C)¹⁾, which does not contain the first Ambaka. By the bye, it may be noted that none of those MSS has the complete text. L. von Mankowski who published the Pāṇetantī portion of *Bhikṣu* in 1892²⁾ had but one MS. I.e. B to make use of, this portion being wanting both in A and C³⁾.

By this additional number of slokas — 308 — published for the first time by Mankowski, the proportion of the printed portion of the *Bhikṣu* to that not yet printed was brought up to almost 1 10 1/2%.

In the meanwhile several more MSS have been discovered. V. Richter in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* registers 4 in the first, 3 in the second and 2 in the third volume *sub voce* *Bhikṣu* besides 2 others that consist of smaller fragments (as one mentioned in Part III which contains only the *Vetula* portion) among them are also the copies which Burnell had caused to be taken of A. Besides he mentions in Part I, 2 MSS *sub titulo* *Bhikṣu* one of which is his *Kāṭh* 7 the other is one of the pustulini that belonged to the pandit Radhakṣara of Lahore. Probably the 6 notices refer to the work of Ksemendra⁴⁾.

Finally, in 1901 the whole work has been printed at the *Varanasi* Press. The title page names Mahādhīpādhyakṣa Pandit C. datta and K. m. P. d. as editors. There is no preface at all nor is there given any account of the MSS that are the basis for the constitution of the text. From the short and scanty critical footnotes we are allowed to infer that the editors had two manuscripts at their disposition one denoted *Ṭ* and the other *Ṭ* each of them full of gaps and corruptions but together they make up almost the complete poem. Neither of them may be identified with C or some copy of C since the first Ambaka is wanting in neither. The MS *Ṭ* is either = B

or very close to it. It seems to be different from both A and B. The Nanyang Press must have possessed one of them in 1888 for on the first page of its edition of the Kathasaritagara foot note 3 contains an information about *asmadīyan Brāhmin* *jar pustalan* of which it is said that it is *acudhan, pīrānīle kīnat tritān asti*. The second must have been acquired between 1888 and 1901.

The edition itself (Kavyamala 69) exhibits a disadvantageous contrast to the valuable edition of Kathasaritagara printed at the same Nanyang Press. The avowedly bad condition of the MSS available does not afford a sufficient excuse for the bad workmanship of those who carried out the edition princeps of a so highly important text. They discharged themselves of their task carelessly and hastily and did not avail themselves of the ready at hand instruments for correcting obvious misreadings in their manuscripts. In 1871 Buhler could not know that the father of Ksemendra was named Pīlāndra when he edited *Ind Ant I 307 n 2 Pralacanlibhullo bhavati* he reproduced the reading of his MS the rights of which he was not able to control at that time. But the two Pandits editing in 1901 a work of Ksemendra should not have kept that corrupted reading in their text (see p 619 cl 31 and esp eg p 161 cl 2 of the Divyavārtana edited in 1891 at the same Nanyang Press by the same Kīrtiśīla and his father Durgaprasāda). A close comparison with the parallel passages in Katha being a valuable help, yet almost indispensable for any one who had undertaken the task of a critical edition worthy of the Kavyamala series, they show but very rarely that they did so as a rule they either neglected that useful and easy cross-examination or did so in a superficial manner. To leave aside their neglect or ignorance of the readings published by Buhler I can mention in the portions edited previously 1) they failed sometimes to realize the incoherent and perturbed condition of the text of their manuscripts. Lamb XIV p 491 cl 309 they were not aware that the former line is a ditto-graphy of cl 307a. — In Lamb IX p 271—277 the story of Candrakāya is rendered wholly unintelligible, owing to the fact that two different portions of it are intermixed. Remove cl 745b—761 from their place and insert them between 728 and 729 all will be put

1) Thinking it may be profitable to the perusers of the edition of Brāhma to have at hand the better readings of the European scholars for correcting the bad ones of their printed text I have put them together in an appendix annexed to this chapter.

right and the concord with the parallel passage in Kathīs (73, 305—359) will be restored — Another instance of the same lack of attention P 102 and 403 of their edition in the same lambaka IX the 3^d gucchā (çl 1—10) opens with the continuation of the adventures of Mrgakadattā at the point when Viaghrasenā finishes his relation of the events which had happened to himself and his comrades whereupon Mrgakadattā sets out for Ujjain, these matters are told in Kathī tār 101 and 102 But at çl 11 we are on a sudden transported into the story of Keśitā and Kandarapā a quite different tale which is found in Kathīs tū 123 From çl 11 to 64 the narration of Ksemendra corresponds to Kathīs 123 203—430 But at çl 64 lo we are back again as suddenly as we left them before to the gallant Mrgakadattā and his faithful followers What has happened? That portion of the story of Keśitā which disturbs in that singular manner the regular course of the Mrgakadattā-tāthi was by some accident or other gone astray and had been put into the wrong place By transporting it to p 430 in lambaka X and filling up with it the large gap which the editors signalize on that page after çl 241 the due order will be restored — In lamb XIV the çlokas 401, 402 and 407 have been put into a wrong place they ought to be transposed after çl 394

Upon the whole I conclude the so called edition of the Brhat Kathamajjarī scatters with errors of print and of other kind

But even so we receive that editio princeps thankfully Now at least that important poem is brought within the reach of everybody and not to be silent also about something praiseworthy in the work of the two Pundits the alphabetical list of proper names subjoined offers a precious help to who ever desires to compare with each other the different Sanskrit representative of a given story told in the original Prākṛit Brhatkathā Now also every one may easily control the exactness of the judgment of Buhler and Levi on the nature and the poetical worth of the abstract of that poem composed by Ksemendra Its length is a little greater than was to be expected from the statement of Buhler *Ind. Ant.* 11 p 304 about the colophon of the MS acquired by him the whole work is estimated there at 7080 anth yet the printed text of the Brhatkathamajjarī amount to a little more than 7561 çlokā y

Since the Kathāsaritsāgara, if I have exactly computed, consists of 21388, the size of Kṣemendia's abstract is a little greater than the third part of that composed by Somadeva

The following synopsis may show the concordance of the lambakas in both

<i>Bṛhathkathāmāñjarī</i>		<i>Kathāsaritsāgara</i>	
Kathā-pītha	lambaka I in 3 guechas of 72 + 223 + 97 = 392 çl.	lambaka I in 8 tarangas =	818 çl
Kathā-mukha	" II in 2 guechas of 117 + 274 = 421 "	" II „ 6 „	= 871 „
Lāvānaka	" III = 114 „	" III „ 6 „	= 1198 „
Naravā- hṛnjanma	" IV = 142 „	" IV „ 3 „	= 501 „
Caturdā- rikā	" V = 263 „	" V „ 3 „	= 818 „
Sūryapra- bha	" VI = 215 „	" VIII „ 7 „	= 1544 „
Madana- mançukā	" VII = 612 „	" VI „ 8 „	= 1421 „
Velā	" VIII = 75 „	" XI „ 1 „	= 115 „
Çacānka- vatī	" IX in 3 guechas of 882 + 1435 + 118 = 2435 „	" XII „ 36 „	= 1929 „
Vṛamaçila	" X = 288 1/2 „	" XVIII „ 5 „	= 1120 „
Madnāvati	" XI = 83 „	" XIII „ 1 „	= 220 „
Padmāvati	" XII = 115 „	" XVII „ 6 „	= 993 „
Pañca	" XIII = 236 „	" XIV „ 1 „	= 624 „
Ratna- prabhā	" XIV = 508 „	" VII „ 9 „	= 1628 „
Alamkā- ravati	" XV = 375 „	" IX „ 6 „	= 1739 „
Çaktiyoças	" XVI = 646 „	" X „ 10 „	= 2128 „
Mahā- bhūçaka	" XVII = 55 „	" XV „ 2 „	= 301 „
Surat i- manjari	" XVIII = 215 „	" XVI „ 3 „	= 120 „

) This number is a little too low, and the former as much too high, owing to the intermixture of part of the story of Kṛṣṇa and Kaṇarpa in the adventures of Mṛga-
kalatta, as is explained above

Two things in this juxtaposition strike the eyes the *different arrangement* after the fifth lambaka, and the *inequality* in the treatment of the subject matters in both collections. Putting off the difference in the order of the lambakas and the question as to the original arrangement in the Prākṛit Bihatkathā to the following chapter, the difference as regards the briefness or the detailed description in narrating the same tales is sometimes very considerable. In some lambakas Kāthāpāthā, Kathāmukha, Çaçūkakavati, Samatamajjari Ksemendra makes up a little less than half the number of *śloka*s of Somadeva, but in others he is much shorter. In Viśamācā, Ratnaprabhā, Citardhikā and Çaktiçāra the proportion is between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{3}$, in Alamkāravati between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{5}$, Suvāpabha has in the collection of Somadeva even more than six times the size it has in the Bihakamajjari, owing, methinks, to the dislike of Ksemendra to dwell on the particulars of that battle epic of the old stamp, which describes a victory of Asuras over Devas and which under the able hands of Somadeva has grown into a charming heroic poem adorned with the manifold art but not too much crowded with the luxuriant excrescences of his native alamkāra.

A close comparison of the several parallel narrations in both cannot but confirm that impression of inequality. It will soon appear that it is the fault of Ksemendra not of Somadeva who, in striking contrast with his rival, has succeeded in keeping throughout the whole length of his composition the same style and the same proportions of his narrative. By this equilibrium and harmony he surpasses Ksemendra in a very high degree. Likewise by his limpidity and his moderation in the employment of the various artifices, tricks and habits taught by Indian poetics and practised by Indian writers. He possesses qualities relatively seldom found with Sanskrit court poets and sought for in vain in the Bihatkathamajjari. We have quoted above (p. 11) the verdict pronounced in a few words by Bunnell about the *obscurity* and the *tedious waste of rhetoric embellishments* which spoil the pleasure while reading there the same stories that captivate the reader of the Kathāsarisaṅgraha. In fact, aiming at the glory of producing a compendious Bihatkathā, Ksemendra does too often care little about the clearness and perspicuity of style which are indispensable requisites in a story teller, on the other hand his aspiration at the fame of a master in *carīṇīyā* makes him rather propense to subordinate the contents of the tales to the opportunity of rhetorical show. For skilled as he was in handling the manifold tools of *alamkāra* and being eager for displaying that skill, he too often delights in such descriptions

as he thought suitable for displaying his mastership in poetics
Purpureus, late qui splendet, nris et alter assuitur pannus

Since it does not lie within the scope of this disquisition to enter into an estimation of the poet Ksemendra, I refer the reader to the brilliant essay on this subject of SIVARAM LAL in the *Journ As* of 1885. Yet it may be suitable to urge some prominent characteristics which appear in the *Bhāṭṭathamanyu*. Ksemendra has a relish for expatiating in describing erotic matters. So at the outset of *lamb IX* corresponding to *Kathā* 68, 1 foll., he interweaves in the visit of Lalitālochan to Naravāhanī datta a description of her beauty, not found in the *Kathā*. In the first *vetala* tale he complacently enlarges the account of the voluptuous *vetala* of Padmavati and her prince, the verse *Bhik* p 297 120—126 correspond to the one *cloka* *Kathas* 75 131. In the 7th *vetala* *ks* (= 6th *Som*) three additional *śloka*s (p 319 397—399) are bestowed on the beauty of the bathing *lambress*. The story of *Jimutavahana* as narrated in the 16th *vetala* offers him the opportunity of drawing a detailed picture of the extraordinary grace and beauty of *Malayavati* which he executes in due order beginning with a praise of her feet and concluding with the top of her head, no less than twelve *śloka*s are required for it whereas the *Kathasarisagara* can suffice with five (*Bhik* p 301 792—803 *ep* to *Kathas* 90 11—15). — Among the digressions of a different nature I mention *Bhik* p 389 1275—1283 praise of *Sundarisenā* his beauty and prowess (*ep* *Kathas* 101 46) p 461 138—145 praise of lake *Pampi* (*ep* *Kathas* 107 9) p 239 290—305 dance of *Hamsavali* (*ep* *Kathas* 71 76 77) p 300 *cl* 788—789 description of the penance grove of *Jimutavahana* of the sea and of the tempest, that broke the ship of *Samudradatta* (p 121 *cl* 78 foll.) of heavenly and atmospheric phenomena (p 57 *cl* 112 foll.) Likewise p 292 62 foll the *śamśapitree* with the dead body hanging on it not to speak of that famous bombastic patch descriptive of the awful cemetery in the first *vetala* treated by *Lalā Journ As* 1886 I p 191.

The fault of too great conciseness and of obscurity in telling the tales is exhibited very distinctly. Some portions of the *Bhikman* *Jam* suffer more from it than others. Mankowski who edited the *Pancatantra* section happened to fall into a part of the poem, where its author seems to have striven at the utmost brevity perhaps owing to his averseness from apologies or to some other reason he hurried over that track of the Great Tale. Nor did he feel much liking for the *mukhakathas* which, in *Somadeva's* poem are inter

spread between the different parts of *Pravartantra*. Most of them he put aside entirely, the few to which he gave a place — twelve upon the whole (one of them not found in *Kathās*) against 47 in *Kathās* — are so condensed that they can hardly be understood and have lost all their flavour. So e.g. this *śloka*

abudho bhādadaryud elasmī madadhe ghate

īkṣm jalam ca karyartham jenasau kusyatam yayau ||

(p. 588, cl. 572)

is the parallel of *Kathās* 61, 10—13

mandabuddhir abhūt kaccit, pūman nṛṣ sa caikada

prabhate devatapujam karisyann ity acintayat ||

upayuktan mama śnanadhupidyartham jalānalan,

sthapayam tad elasthan, tan cighram prapūjyam yatha ||

ity alocyambukumbhantak kṣiptagnim samīueṣa sah

prataṣ ca īkṣate yayad gato 'gnir nastam ambu ca ||

anqaramaline toye dīṣṭe tasyubhavan mukham

tudrg eva, sahasasya lokasyasit p īkṣ smitam ||

The following one

īkṣit yadhuḥ ca yayaya labdhīlalamkaranam bahu

rasanum abudhak kanthe haram ca jaghanasthale ||

(p. 588, cl. 575)

is the simple remnant of the story related by Somadeva (61, 24—27) in this manner

grumyah īkṣit kṣanan bhūmim prapalanakaranam malat ||

ratraṁ rajakulac caurair nīta tatra nūḍṣitam

yad grhitva sa tatraiva bhūyam tena vyabhiśayat ||

babandha mekhalam murdhur haram ca jaghanasthale

nīpāvan karayos tasyah Iarnayor apī kaulānan ||

hasadbhit klyptam lokair buddhva rajā jalura tat

tasmat ubhayanam, tan tu paśuprayam mūroca sah ||

Such cases, however of extreme aridity are comparatively rare. On the other hand, now and then the mind of the reader is gladdened when he fills in with some piece written in an easy and pleasing style and without misuse of rhetoric implements, and which though inferior to the greater genius of Somadeva may stand to some extent the comparison with their parallels in the *Kathāsarit-saṁgraha*. The narrative, in a few cases, may be even broader. The episode of *Kālmāśana* carried through the air by the son of Somaprabhā her friend, firstly to old Civenyit [= Prieniyit in *Kathās*] afterwards to young Udayana is told in eighteen *ślokas* (p. 186 339—366) whereas twelve suffice in the correspondent

place of Kathis (31 '0—11) The fable of the mouse, the cat, the owl and the khincumon is, if not fuller, yet more detailed in the *Bṛhannyaṣa* (p. 194 177—196) than it is in Kathi 33 106—129 This confirms once more what I have said about the *inequality* of the work of Ksemendra who at other times took such care to epitomize stories told at great extent in his original, that he e.g. reduced the chief incidents of the story of Aśokadattā to a few lines (cp *Bṛhannyaṣa* p. 126 with Kathi 23 162 foll.) and summarized the whole tide of *Muktaphaladhyaṣa* which fill up two trimeters of 116 śloka together in Kathi 3, in *seven* ślokas (*Bṛhannyaṣa* p. 148 101—115) ¹

To notice also another feature which struck me while perusing the poem of Ksemendra, he *clings more to things religious* than Somadeva. I do not say that his religious feeling is deeper. In common natures profoundness of that sentiment is ordinarily not found and I am inclined to give more credit in that point to the fine and delicate mind of the knower of men to whom we owe the Kathi than to the polygraphist made of coarse stuff always ready to write a poem on a given subject. Ksemendra was well versed in mythological and theological matters. One of his spiritual teachers was a fervent Bhāṭṭa; another his upādhyāya in rhetoric the famous Čaṇa philosopher Abhinavagūptā and he must have grown up in an atmosphere of devout practice. We learn from the preface at the end of his *Bṛhannyaṣa* as well as from the appended to other poems of his that his father was a very pious man and wealthy too who placed tithes of land in the temple of Śrīvāmbhū and bestowed a quarter of a *kaṭi* viz. 2¹ millions on pious works. Among his other writings two bear an exclusively religious character: one of them the *Digvijayacandrikā* praises the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu in the other the *Avadmakalpikā* his last composition he extols with a magnificent apparel the lofty deeds of self-sacrifice of the Bodhisattva. He was thoroughly acquainted it seems with both religions ²) and would willingly preach in his verses on topics of morals and religion. That is why even

¹) There are even a few instances of tales summarized in one śloka, as I w. Canla mahānaga got his wife the daughter of the Daśa Aggrāhā (4 180) and the story of Čakra (p. 3314) who bore the first leelinent nṛśaśa to correct a statement about the absence of that story from the *Bṛhannyaṣa*. Article on The Man with the Wheel (*East Asiatic Society of Copenhagen* 1906) Volke *Kāṇḍaśāstra* Net 1 de 1906 p. 190. The name Čakra does not occur in the index of the edited text.

²) His familiarity with Buddhist tenets and Buddhist literature appears if we compare parallel places of him and Somadeva in those cases where Buddhist matters play a

such a worldly poem, as this abstract of the Bihatkathā really is, contains comparatively large portions devoted to such matters. Devatāstutis are not wanting in the Kathās neither, both Somadeva and Kṣemendra must have found them in the Pūṣpācī original, but on such occasions the latter in length and exuberance of them outdoes the former. In the story of the Kaṣmīr king Bhūnanda or Bhūnandana — cp Bṛh p 266 foll with Kathās 73, 79 foll — who took his way to Pātālā through a Kaṣmīr entrance to the subterranean world, the local legend about this *aditus ad inferos* is incidentally related, how Pradyumna, watching for his son Anuruddha led away to Pātālā by his sweetheart Uṣṭī, obtained from Gaurī the favour that she would keep guard on the mountain commanding that entrance. In Kathās 73, 110 it is simply said that „he won over Cīrikā with hundreds of prizes”, Kṣemendra makes him utter a stotra in full ten ślokas (642—651). The concluding lambaka (XVIII) of the latter relates among other things the death of the old king Uḍṇana. On hearing the news of it, Nāravahmadatta, his son, bursts out in lamentations. To Somadeva a few lines suffice to describe this complaint, his affliction and mourning and the words of consolation of his attendance (cp the parallel passage t 111, 86 foll), Kṣemendra would not allow himself to lose this opportunity of dwelling upon common-place sentences about the vanity and vanity of all human things and the necessity of death, he spends on that sermon no less than *thirty* ślokas. In another case he combines his claim of paramount poetical skill with his devotion, when he describes the glory and great feats of Viṣṇu in artful prose embellished by long compounds and the like, which passage by a singular whim he put into his metrical composition, no other prose occurring in it. It is found p 526 of the printed text and corresponds with the stuti Kathās t 54, 29—38. On another occasion, in vetīla nr 12, we meet with *three* uṣṭī stanzas to expound the power of karma and its fruit, corresponding with *one* similar stanza of Somadeva (Bṛh p 335, 597—599 cp with Kath 86, 15). Sometimes his predilection for moral sentences and the like makes him do wrong to the *anecdote* he had to observe in the representation of the hero of his tale. In the 16th vetīla, a subject matter quite of his liking — for it

part in the narration. So P 158, cl 9 Sukhavatī, the Elvium of Malaviya, is mentioned, but then it puzzled the editors who put a sign of interruption after it, likewise p 52, cl 616 where the corrupt form from one *maśāra nīma* has been put into the text, the other has *śāśā nīma* — P 166 in the sermon on *śāśā nīma* the name of king Arhi occurs, but it has hidden under the corruptions *śāśā* and *śāśā*.

deris with Jimutavahana's self-sacrifice, and in fact, no less than 170 glokas of his succinct poem are occupied with it, but 30 less than the number of Somadeva's narrative of the same story — it is told how the Bodhisattva intervened at the very moment when the mother of the Naga was taking leave of her son destined to become the prey of the Ganda. In this point he makes Jimutavahana address the mother as follows (p. 355)

*mitah sthito smi te putraparidhau rataksaral
paropahitah samvire nirsure prapjate kutal ||* 576

*ayam eva sadipaye laye snasamuccayah
yat prayati parayusathanasatpunyaparatam ||* 577

He displays here a want of taste which is offensive. Such boasting of his self-sacrifice does not become the hero. Somadeva makes him say nothing more than the few words *mitah putram rataksaralam tava* (t. 90. 131) his Bodhisattva does not perch in that critical moment but acts only.

Both poets were Kashmirans and almost coeval. They belong to the eleventh century, at what time Kashmir was a centre of Sanskrit learning and literary productions. Bühner demonstrated in 1885 that Somadeva composed the Kathasamithagata between 1063 and 1082.¹⁾ As to Ksemendra he said: Dices Resultat zeigt dass Somadeva entweder genau zu derselben Zeit schrieb als Ksemendra Vyāsadas seine Bihattithamraya verfasste oder nur wenig später. Es ist jedenfalls ein merkwürdiges Zu sammen treffen dass zwei kashmirische Dichter um dieselbe Zeit das alte Buch Gaudhyas aus dem Pusici Dialecte ins Sanskrit übersetzten. Es sieht beinahe so aus alsob sie Rivalen gewesen wären. SIVARAY LARI urged both points. As to Ksemendra's priority in time his argument developed in the *Journal Asiatique* 1886. I. 216 foll.

is to this effect. Considering that he composed three extracts of celebrated epics the Bharatamraya the Ramayanamraya and the Bihattithamraya, and that this triad makes up the least accomplished portion of his complete works, he holds it for probable that all three belong to his beginnings. Now le Bharatamraya le premier des ouvrages d'arts de Kshemendra est antérieur de vingt-sept ans à l'année 1064 et de 145 ans à l'année 1082. Il serait crovons nous étrange de supposer qu'un poète rompu par une si longue pratique connu déjà par une quantité d'œuvres de toute sorte se fut réduit à traduire en sanscrit une œuvre puérile.

¹⁾ St. 125b der Wene. *Stute epl to a list of the Classe CX. 51b foll.* The passage quoted is on p. 358.

et même, cette hypothèse admise, qu'il se fût, avec un acquit de quelque tiente on quante ans, aussi mal tue de la besogne" This argument, a „man-on presque de sentiment", as it is styled by LEVI himself, has not so great stress as the other derived from the introductory verses of the Kathāsaritsāgara, t 1, 11 and 12

*aucityamayarakṣa ca yathucakṛti vidhiyate
katharasāṅghatena kāṭyāyacasya ca yojana ||
vidagdhyaḥhyatilobhaya mama nairāyam udyamah
kim tu nanakathajālasmitisaukṛtyasiddhaye ||*

These ślokas, according to him, are an implicit disapproval of the work of his predecessor, which as a matter of fact is imbued with the selfsame defects as are disclaimed by Somadeva in order to justify his own composition. In this point I fully agree with LEVI. Śloka 12 so unmistakably hints at some rival poet or some rivalizing literary work, that long before I knew anything about the Brhatkathīmānuṣū, I understood Somadeva's declaration as having a polemic character. And forsooth, he who knows both Sanskritizations of the Brhatkathā cannot but acknowledge in Somadeva's protestation against the *vidagdhyaḥhyatilobha* his making front against the rhetorical style of Ksemendra and that showy self-ostentation as perspicuous among others in his *prāśasti* at the end of his poem, where he boasts of himself *Ksemendranama tanayas tasya vidatsa vicitrah / prayatah / avigosthisu namagrahanayogyatam* (p. 620, śl. 36) „Il semble donc naturel de croire qu'en arrivant ces vers Somadeva pensait à son précurseur."

My interpretation of śl. 11 is different from that of LEVI. This is partly in consequence of a various reading partly because he misunderstood the meaning of the words *aucitya* and *anāyaya*. As to the difference of reading, *vidhiyate* (Dingpr's ed.) seems preferable to *abhidhiyate* (Brockhaus), but in 1886 the ed. of Dingpr had not yet appeared¹⁾ *Aucitya* does not mean 'les convenances littéraires', it is the technical term to signify 'appropriateness

¹⁾ I am inclined to think that the fault in Brockhaus' ed. does not originate in his times but in some mistake either in copying or rather of the typographer (śl. 10 l. 2 l. 4 ed. has *vidhiyate* instead of *abhidhiyate* but śl. 11, l. 1 *abhidhiyate* for *vidhiyate*). There can be no question about the correctness of the readings of Dingpr's edition. The false ones have led a travesty which every scholar who before tried to explain these lines. As long as the interpretation rested on a corrupt text they were reputed to be "difficult" the genuine text is plain.

²⁾ „J'ai respecté autant que j'ai pu les convenances littéraires et l'ordre naturel j'ai établi chacune des sections du poème de manière à ne pas interrompre les scènes

taken in the widest sense of the word and being as well on the different objects, character individualities to be represented in a poetical composition as on the adorning implements and the choice of words expressions and images 1) *Aucityamaya* then is the same as *aucityamulatam* literally, the being provided with appropriateness. I have also misunderstood *kavyamasya yojana* Minkow rightly objects that the sing *kavyamasya* cannot at any rate mean chacune des sections du poeme (see the passage quoted p. 22 note 2), but his own interpretation, that *kavyamasya* should be referred to some special part of the poem is right neither to catch the meaning of *kavyamasya* it must be compared with *devanāgarī*, *aravindarāga* and the like Somadeva declares that he does not claim the pretension of making a *kāvya* out of the *Bhāṭikā* he has only admixed a small portion of *kāvya* qualities to the simple collection of popular tales In other terms *aravind* has here a signification not unlike *gandhā* at the end of compounds taught by Panini V 4 136 a tinge of a little of My translation of it is accordingly I have taken care to preserve the appropriateness (of description diction etc of the original work) and I have added to it some qualities proper to a *kāvya* without however spoiling by this the flavour of the tales I have added elegance of style and many a poetical ornament yet so that I have not deprived the tales of their power to express the *rāsas* or sentiments aimed at

This prefatory declaration of Somadeva is as true as it is modest. He displays in a high degree *l'art de faire un livre*. His narrative captivates both by its simple and clear though very elegant style and diction and by his skill in drawing with a few strokes pictures of types and characters taken from the real every day life. Hence it is that even in the marvellous and fantastic facts and events that make up the bulk of the main story and of a great deal of the incidental tales the interest of the reader is uninterruptedly kept. His lively and pleasant art of story telling — though now and then encumbered with inflatedness or vitiated by far-fetched fictions —

et les passions (ra as) (il p 910) This translation is not given as will be shown in the following chapter as far as regards the meaning of a better than quote I send a definition of the term in

) I can do nothing better than quote 1
1 et ja ei carei si 7 (ei kavyam 1 11)

7 (el kavyam l 110)
 veta i d r act yll s lte i t l a j a m y t
 t a t c i j o l l a t i l c t l a t e

In the following clock 8-101 enumerates the only particular times to which such data is applicable

wit¹), that drawback of so many Sanskrit literary high style productions — is enhanced also by his native humour and the elegant and pointed sentences strewn about here and there with a good taste. One instance may exemplify the distance which separates in this respect the two abbreviators of the Brhatkathā. Vararuci relates to Cakṛatā, how he got befriended with the Rākṣasī. With Ksemendra as well as Somadeva this account takes up three ślokas. In the following columns Kṣ is placed on the left, Som on the right

Brhikṃ p 22, 186—188

*dandadhīpatyam āsūdyā
rājāham śrayam arthitah }
rakṣasā kalarūpena
tenarā niṣi samgatah ||*

*sa mām uāca cakṛtam .
uācanayograyagrahaḥ }
rupenabhyadhīta nari
ka, satyanti kathyatam iti ||,*

*ya yasyābhīmatu lola
sa tasyadbhikarupini |
sa niṣamyeti madhukyam
samtuṣṭo mitratam agut ||*

Kathīs 5, 50—52

*tac chrutū Yoganando mām
, āśrayaṃ nagaradhīpam }
'bhramanti caparyam atṛakam
bhramantam rakṣasam nri ||*

*sa ca mām arādad bruhī
vidyate nagare 'tra ka }
surupā stritū tac chrutū
'tīhasyukam tam abrayam ||*

*ya yasyābhīmatā mūrkhā
suripā tasya sa bhārat |
tac chrutāna tiyāsiṇa
jito 'smity arādat sa mām ||*

APPENDIX

List of necessary corrections from Lévi and Mankowski to be made in the Bombay ed. of *Bihatkathāmañjarī*.

- p 2, çl. 13 Lévi *sudhāsindhugarbha*^o, — 3, çl 21 L *piyāśahasite*, — 4, çl. 42 L *°akulā cīram*, — 8, çl 22 L (MS A) *idyā Varsād dvijad vo 'stu piāpyeti*, — 10, çl 39 L *hemalabhah sadā yasya*, — 11, çl 49 *dhārat adhiho vege*, — çl 52 L *ptatah, satatam kāñcanapīradah*, — çl 60 b L *andhāvittanī vedhakuntīyupidān*, — p 13, çl 79 and where further on the word occurs *dandapāçikāh*¹⁾ for *dandācāśalah*, — 14, çl 80 L (MS A) *prastut ipahnavaḥ pāpo*, — 16, çl 112 L *hemalotin aham svayam*, cp 113 d; — 19 çl 145 L *yo 'yam çilharīsamkacāh çāl hāñcalayasamkulah*, — 20, çl 157 L *pratimāpāṣam adbhutam*, cp Kathās 5, 29, — çl 161 L *antahpūñçayān*, — çl. 169 L (MS A) *çuñçuñç dul'hasamīptah*, — 21, çl 170 L *çālatātām sakhe . . . ratito bhavān*, — çl 172 L *tam ālarçayam* — çl 177 *çāñarmāpy açankitah*, cp Kathās 5, 69 foil, — 23, çl 207 *vādheā* instead of *baddha*, — 24, çl 214 *matīa* for *mātya* — p 26, çl 9 L has this necessary line added from MS A between 9a and 9b *yah çapamośam ymāyos dāñanina idhāsyañ* — çl 11 *aññitamayo vāidyah* — 31, çl 70 *mujlhamanasam* — 32, çl 88 *budhas tījyanty anī adji*
- p 290, çl 39 Lévi *kamāpāh* instead of *lā'sah* — p 291 çl 50 *bhūantā lampāna*^o, — p 293, çl 67 *matalah*, — çl 72 *sphatikamān to aḥ* — p 294, çl 78 *vyākōçaphullācālu anam ianm*, — p 295, çl 90 *tiñy i tīmopasucātam* — p 299, çl 149 *supratipāh pratipauḥarīh kūrīn mīk an lita i dīyah i āsadya i ājaputras tām*, — p. 301, çl 166 *te yatajivīn* ^o *ālorah çuñçuñç dīyāh* — çl 177 *vadanapīatimācandīam* — p 302, çl 182 *putralāyayam*
- p 561, çl 256 Mankowski *suñapu opamam* The ed has *Uchilaroq ya*^o likewise p 572, çl 392 *Mi*^o, — çl 263 *imā i çasthagītakīamāh* — p 562, çl 269 *puram yanyū* — çl 271 *sphūstastambhāmastatāñkārān* — p 563, çl. 280 *piāyena* (by conjecture) for *mākīna*, — çl 281 *dukkīe* (by conj) for *dukkhāh*, — çl 283 *yad bilasādhyam*, — p 564, çl 291 *iyīam* for *iyīam*, — çl 293 *simhas tam etiya*, — çl 296 *tātadāmītrāpīte* — p 565, çl 303 *sadotsel isia simhas* — p 566, çl 313 *darpāt so 'nyān imabhyetya* — p 568, çl 336 *īpatpiptau*, — p 569, çl 356 *il sas*, — çl 359 *iāsarān* ^o *durlakīyāh* (a good conjecture), — p 570, çl 362 *tatah*, — p 571, çl 373 *tad iñsasya* ^o *taduktīr i yāyāt param*, — çl 374 *nudāmīty abhāvata*, — çl 378 *kutīrāt*, — çl. 379 *sarpan* ^o *māgam*, — ¹⁾ p 573, çl 404 *yate kāl*, — p 574, çl 413 *yantrārātham*, — p 575, çl 420 *yendham abha iam dhīstas tat* (a good conj), — çl 425 *buddhakatī astu āyayan* ^o *sarāngah*, — çl 428 *deçakālajñātā kīa te*, — p 576, çl 431 *mīntharo 'pi*, — çl 434 *cāñtāyan ksanam*, — çl 437 *Meghācāñādhhyah*, — çl 439 *sa*

¹⁾ Or *dandapāçalah* Both forms occur in Lévi

²⁾ P 573, çl 393 I read *acodayat* for *anodīyāt* of both editions

sanyakṣayaśoka śah *niryuktān yuktīkovidān*, — cl 110 *tva nam anyah*
parākramam — p 377, cl 444 *tyakti sudurlabhaḥ*, — cl 447 *glattayan*, —
cl 451 *prasiddhya śaśino nāma* (a good conjecture, cp Pañc III, 82, ed Buhler-
kielhorn), — p 378, cl 454 *simlito śatatarasū*, — cl 455 *Vyayam for*
Vilayam, cp Kathas 62, 32, — cl 461 *eśmadantū ādinau* (a good conjecture)¹⁾,
— p 379, cl 466 *śatikṣaya*, — cl 468 *śanthe tavidah*, — p 380, cl 486
tulyakālāt, — p 381, cl 489 *Aramaide .. kal mulrogaśālīni* (a good
conjecture), — cl 490 *dīsta / laksmih*, cp cl 367, — cl 491 *vamicyante*, — cl
500 *tyalo tiāha* [or perhaps better *tyakti dīham*], the ed Bomb has here mere
nonsense, — p 382, cl 506 *abhyudhikām*, — cl 510 *smārca sya cītiān*
durge, — p 383, cl 519 *sadbhrtjo vrdharavarasah*²⁾, — cl 521 *badiṭṭe* instead
of *iṇḍḍe*; and *tisteta* for *tistantu*, — p 384, cl 529 *pulun lumosam* (a good
conjecture) — p 386, cl 552 *aśani vilaya bhac u yo hu bhū u su tisjiti / sa*
layito saktigūḷam bhankti et a mayam ajrojan — cl 554 *kṛti for kila* —
p 387, cl 557 *kurita*, — cl 558 *grhapositam*, — cl 562 *dīstia* for *dīstīm*

This list is of course limited to those cases, where evident corrections or the better readings from MSS have been overlooked by neglect of previous publications, which no editor of the *Bṛhat-kāthamāñjarī* ought to ignore. What inference is to be drawn from this as to the authority of the Bombay edition in the by far much greater part of the poem, where it is in fact the *editio princeps* in its fullest sense?

Inverely there are found sometimes a few better readings in the Bombay edition, adopted from the two mss on which that edition is based. Lévi and Mañikowski did not find them in the mss at their disposal. But the number of this kind of various readings is rather small and it is now no longer of utility to enumerate them. I only mention one instance. P. 1, cl 3 *ghākaḥ* is of course the right reading, not *dhūlāḥ*, as was edited by Lévi, *ghūka* 'owl' is not rarely met with in the Brhātkaṭhām, e.g. p. 576, cl. 441 and p. 581, cl. 499.

⁴⁾ For α_{11} is to be correct d into $\mu_{11}\alpha$, so that the whole becomes $\mu_{11}\alpha_{11}\alpha_{11}\alpha_{11}\alpha_{11}$.

*) G. 518 I correct thus: *Ull: kyus tain tajan chrota ja i tat taya*

CHAPTER II.

THE BRĪHATKATHĀ ITS CONTENTS

In the first chapter it has been shown that the conclusions drawn from a putal comparison in 1871 by Bühler as to the mutual relation of the poems of Ksemendra and Somadeva as epitomes of the Brġhatkathā are fully confirmed by a cross examination of the two complete works. There can be not the least doubt about the existence in Kashmere in the eleventh century of that vast encyclopedia of tales in the Pañcāī dialect which is acknowledged as the common source of both Brġhatkathāmāyā and Kathāvat-sīgara. Now the question arises, whether it is possible to resuscitate that old Pañcāī Brġhatkathā with the help of its Sanskrit redactions.

Of course, only materially. Considering that Somadeva avowedly abridged his original and Ksemendra tacitly for he is silent about it abridged it likewise and even much more, since his abridgement is three times shorter than the Kathas, the impossibility of bringing back even for a small part its verbal form need no further demonstration. I have met with five lines common to both Brġh p 173, 183 = Kath t 28, 182 the second part of Brġhkm 131, 9 and Kath 101, 17, the śloka Brġhkm 496, 342 = Kath 10 216 22a. Here the presumption of their being taken from the Pañcāī original with no other alterations than those required by the change of dialect is very great, if we take into consideration that as a rule the concord of both collections of tales as to the contents, even in particulars, is as great as their discrepancy in wording and expression. The cases of their using the same special term or the same turn of phrase are comparatively rare, even when employing the same simile.¹⁾ In such cases, then, there is some probability that such a term and such a phrase are the Sanskrit equivalents of

¹⁾ For g in the King's answer to the Veśāla, at the conclusion of the 17th *śloka* story, bad prices who allow them elms to be led astray by their passions are compared to elephants in rut. Somadeva expresses this comparison by this śloka (91, 54) *ayam iva ta madā h mātā gayā na nirañ uśah / chū lantī dhar m muryā tī tī klātī rī rī yonmuktī ā, ksemendra quite differently (p 303, 51 972) uttī r m lāsa nrañ tī tī amulā tī tī rāj / na sṛmanti na paṇyanti rājānah kalyāṇa na*

Yet upon the whole these coincidences are not frequent, and even if they were more numerous than they are, the profit to be obtained from a systematic and exhaustive exploration of them would be small. It is not difficult to put a Pūṣiṣi sub on those words and turns of phrase which it would be made probable that are borrowed by the Sanskrit redactors from the original Pūṣiṣi poem. By applying the scrutiny rules laid down by the grammarians how to make Pūṣiṣi from Śūraseni or from Sanskrit (see Pischri *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen* p. 27—29 p. 135) it may be taken for granted that in the Pūṣiṣi Bīṭhathā the words *studdhatla* *kesari*, *anturapati* *parayo* *tipali* *komaplundam* *muttattal* *so* *latanelacano* *sattkaveso* etc. occurred, but this result is more or less, as early as 1874, in his dissertation *magnum de grammaticis Præsentis* putting together the Pūṣiṣi quotations by Hemacandra in the last chapter of the 8th book of his grammar expressed as his opinion that they are borrowed from the Pūṣiṣi Bīṭhathā (see p. 33 of that dissertation). This is very probable indeed yet the smallness of the few fragments and the circumstance that they consist of some general phrases not applicable to a certain fact or story related in the Bīṭhathā forbids to identify them with corresponding passages in the Sanskrit redactions of the origin of the work is found in a few proper though as a rule of course

A trace of the origin of the work is found in a few proper names Ksemendra and Somadeva though as a rule of course there is conformity in this respect, are not rarely at variance the one calls somebody e.g. Samudradatta who is called Samudramitsva by the other in this way there are a many slight discrepancies as Yajñaketu (Ks) Yaçñaketu (S) Dhṛṇadatta (Ks) Dhṛṇapāṇi (S), Madanamanjari (Ks) Madanīsundari (S) etc etc Sometimes Ksemendra prefers a shorter form of the name the hero of the main story is called throughout Narayana¹⁾ not Narayana-datta as he is invariably named by Somadeva and Mukta(or Mukti) ketu and Multadhvya (Ks p 113 and 419) correspond to the Muktaphalaketu and Muktaphaladhvya of the seventeenth lambika of Somadeva Now, in a few instances it is plain that Ksemendra's names have retained their Pañcici shape whereas Somadeva Sanskritized them Of the kind are Kāmpilva (Kathas 25 23) and śl 6) Iṣṭasvati a name occurring thrice in the Kathas for three different ladies (15 77 30 72 15, 177) is Iṣṭasvati in Brhatham

^{b)} I ven Naravaha (p 14 sl 68 p 502 sl 41) and 418) P 371 70 Nara dhana
as is edited, is to be corrected into Naravaha for a metrical reason

corresponding Pāricī expressions in the original. Of the kind are the epithet *vaidīśvādakesari* of the great dialectician, the Buddhist monk Ratnacandimātī in Bṛhkm 253, 470 and Kath 72, 93, the designation of the superintendent of the zenana, who is fully named to the king as the lover of Guṇavarā, by *antahpurapati* both in Bṛhkm 491, 280 and in its parallel Kath 39, 27, the old king of Cṛāvatī is styled *praraya* both in Bṛhkm 182, 291 and its parallel Kath 30, 30 likewise *triphalu* (Bṛhkm 232, 204 cp Kath 70, 13), *homabhānda* (Bṛhkm 233, 221 cp Kath 70, 70), *muktātākāsa* (Bṛhkm 305, 260 cp Kath 78, 2), *śasthāveśa* (Bṛhkm 232, 209 cp Kath 70, 56), *katanehajana* (Bṛhkm 133, 223 cp Kath 26, 173), *rupadrayanākūṇṣayā* Bṛhkm 497, 348 cp Kath 40, 27), *acrukana* (Bṛhkm 223, 93 *taṭra netrāt Trinetraya patito 'śrukanah lṣtau*) cp Kath 69, 38 so [viz. Çivā] 'smusu pīnateṣu alino dakṣiṇād acrukana lānam/ bhūmā apulayat) 'The uniformity of utterance is hardly fortuitous here. In some other instances the common turn of phrase may point to the common source, the Pūcāī work, as is shown by the following juxtaposition

Bṛhkm	Kathās'
173, 191 <i>cruyate munusāḥ saḥ k- yam bhajanti līla dātātā prthivyatāḥ Prthoh pūrtam putiyā sakhyaṃ Arundhatī bheje</i>	28, 191b <i>dūyā yanti ca munusibhū asamasnehāhīlāḥ saṃgatīm bheje kim nīpateḥ Pṛthos tana- yayā sakhyam na s Arundhatī?</i>
375, 1134 <i>ayam labdho 'si su bhaga kīa gamiṣyasi me purāḥ</i>	95, 74 <i>kīa yasi labdho 'si ma yety ālapanti etc</i>
386, 1239 <i>iāg utacāṣarīm</i>	100, 36 <i>tīrad iag atīa gaganād uccacū acarīm</i>
393, 1320 <i>nabhasvata abhayaṭa prarahanaṃ</i>	101, 141 <i>balayasā/vatena tasya rahanaṃ hanyamānam abhayaṭa</i>
198, 361 <i>sa lādūcin nīyam dīṣṭvā jarūdharatām ānanam satūṣaram nāmbhojam abhuc cin tagutopūṭāḥ</i>	10, 15 <i>hūmāhatam nāmbhojam patitāmhanam ānanam darṣayam latham dīyati? hu dhū me maranam taram</i>
544, 14 <i>dhanyaham itī vadīnyu</i>	57, 77 <i>'dhanyūsmiṭi vadanti ca</i>
553, 155 <i>chittīsa karmānīkām laccastrenaua sakasa praya yau tasya etc</i>	58, 99 <i>laccastrenaua buddhasya lānanūsām cakurta sū</i>

*) I quote according to the reading of MS २४, registered in the foot note, the reading adopted by the editors is obviously a false one

Yet, upon the whole, these coincidences are not frequent, and even if they were more numerous than they are, the profit to be obtained from a systematic and exhaustive exploration of them would be small. It is not difficult to put a Paṇḍī grāh on those words and turns of phrase which it would be made probable that are borrowed by the Sanskrit redactors from the original Paṇḍī poem. By applying the scanty rules laid down by the grammarians how to make Paṇḍī from Čauvasenī or from Sanskrit (see Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen* p 27—29, p 135) it may be taken for granted that in the Paṇḍī Bihatkathā the words *vāttuddirathakesari*, *anteurapati*, *pavayo*, *typhalā*, *homaphāndam*, *muttāṭṭahāso*, *hatānekačano*, *satthāveso* etc. occurred, but this result is meagre. Pischel, as early as 1874, in his „dissertatio inauguralis” *de grammaticis Prākriticis*, putting together the Paṇḍī quotations by Hemacandra in the last chapter of the 8th book of his grammar, expressed as his opinion that they are borrowed from the Paṇḍī Bihatkathā (see p 33 of that dissertation). This is very probable, indeed, yet, the smallness of the few fragments and the circumstance that they consist of some general phrases not applicable to a certain fact or story related in the Bihatkathā forbids to identify them with corresponding passages in the Sanskrit redactions.

A trace of the origin of the work is found in a few proper names. Kṣemendra and Somadeva, though as a rule of course, there is conformity in this respect, are not rarely at variance: the one calls somebody e.g. *Samudrādatta*, who is called *Samudramatsya* by the other, in this way there are a many slight discrepancies, as *Yajñaketu* (Kṣ) *Yaçabketu* (S), *Dhanadatta* (Kṣ) *Dhṛnapāla* (S), *Mudraṃṇarī* (Kṣ), *Madṛasundarī* (S), etc. etc. Sometimes Kṣemendra prefers a shorter form of the name, the hero of the main story is called throughout *Naravāhana*¹⁾, not *Naravāhanadatta*, as he is invariably named by Somadeva, and *Muktī* (or *Mukta*)-*ketu* and *Muktādhvaja* (Kṣ p 413 and 419) correspond to the *Muktīphalaketu* and *Muktāphaladhvaja* of the seventeenth lumbaka of Somadeva. Now, in a few instances it is plain that Kṣemendra's names have retained their Paṇḍī shape, whereas Somadeva Sanskritized them. Of the kind are *Kāmpilya* (Kathās 25, 23) and *Kāmpilla* (Bṛh 120, śl 73), *Potraka* (K 67, 6) and *Potrā* (B 209, śl 6), *Tejasvatī*, a name occurring thrice in the Kathās for three different ladies (18, 77 30, 72 45, 177) is *Tejovatī* in *Bṛhatham*

¹⁾ I ven *Naravāha* (p 474, śl 68, p 502 śl 415 and 418) p 221, 70 *Naravāhana*, as is edited, is to be corrected into *Naravāha* for a metrical reason.

(p 84, čl 187 p 183, 302) ¹⁾, Rādhā (K 71, 29) and Rāthā (B 279, čl 783), Vakiolaki (K 93, 3) and Vīmikolaki (B 369, čl 1011), Thinthīkarāla (K 122, 71) and Thenthīkarālī (B 122, 71) BÖHRER, in his article in the *Ind Ant* (I, p 309) noticed this point already, yet his statement is to be corrected in this, that both S and Ks' agree in the name of Dīpakarni; -Durgaprasād's ed has this form, not Dīpak, as is edited by Brockhaus. Another trace of the original language may be left in the false form of the name Pāvatīkṣa (the Nāga who dispersed Migānkadatta and his comrades) which is read Brhkm p 232, čl 210 *Nāgo Pāvataklho* 'sti bhavane hamsasucite, since the right name appears čl 224, it is probable that Kṣemendra who worked in a hurry misunderstood the first time the meaning of Paṣ *pāvataklho*, but Sanskritized it better afterwards ²⁾

It is of greater importance to examine how much a close comparison of the two Sanskrit redactions may afford in the way of reconstituting the scheme and the arrangement of the old Brhatkathā

It has been shown in the First Chapter (*supra*, p 15 and 16) that the Kathāsaritsāgarā and the Brhatkathāmanujālī agree in the number and the titles of the different lambikas but, after lambika V, disagree in the order of them, even to a considerable degree. Which of the two represents the original Brhatkathā? Or perhaps neither?

As far as I know, the question has not been examined before. Of the Sanskrit scholars who occupied themselves with the Kathāsaritsāgarā, Mrūkowskī alone, I believe, expressed an opinion on this point. P IX of the „Einleitung“ of his work on the Pancatantra portions in Kath and Brhkm, mentioned above (p 12 n 2), he says „Wie aus der Zusammenstellung bei I und zu sehen ist, ist die Reihenfolge der ersten fünf Bücher bei Somadeva genau dieselbe wie bei Kṣhemendra, nur die übrigen dreizehn Bücher sind bei beiden anders geordnet. Ich glaube daher, dass Somadeva in V 11 [of his tr 1, vide *supra*, p 22] unzweideutig erklärt, dass er in diesem Theile seines Gedichts die Anordnung des Stoffes im

¹⁾ But Kathā 17, 31 Somadeva retained Tejovati just as he found it in the Pañcīci Brhatkathā, the corresponding verse apud Kṣemendra is p 79 čl 126.

²⁾ The name Karmasena in the Kathā (t 69 and 112) of the father of (ṣaṇ)kavati, the sweetheart of Migānkadatta, is Kandarjāsena in the Prhkm (see p 222, čl 85 p 102, čl 8). The original had *cille* karmasena, which being written with anusvāra + m, may have induced Kṣemendra in his negligent way to accept it as karmasena, or it was Somadeva who misread the name karmasena, if the long *a* was denoted in his MS of Brhatkathā by a small curve above the akṣara, which he read as *r* before consonant.

and in the proper and suitable way, accordingly as they ought to be represented, in short he praises implicitly the picturesqueness and faithfulness of the stories as they are narrated in the Pañcavi Brhatkathā and shows his care to preserve that virtue in his Sanskrit reduction. He does however state nothing about their arrangement I say, and after him Murkowski were wrong in accepting *amāya* with that meaning and in taking *acitjanāya* for a dvandva compound. *Amāya* has several acceptations but it never means 'order, due order, arrangement' since it may express also the interpretation of words in a sentence viz their being conjoined together, and since it is used for this reason in commentaries as a technical term to denote such construction, — which employment is duly registered in the *Petropolitan Dictionary* s v 6) and in the *Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* s v 4 — I suppose this was the starting point of Levi's wrong inference that *amāya* may also signify 'due order, arrangement' in a more general sense. No Hindoo I think will employ it with this meaning. Artt in his *English Sanskrit Dictionary* translates 'arrangement' by *śācanti, viyasa, saṁvidha vyūhana, kṛā, menā ślupana paripatī kṛāma* — but not by *amāya* nor is *amāya* found among the Sanskrit equivalents of 'order' the only case he mentions is to translate Engl. 'the natural order of words' 1).

The assumed error of Somadeva is to his arrangement of the tales being different from that of the Pañcavi Brhatkathā must, therefore, be put aside. It does not exist at all. Those who believed in its existence were mistaken by an erroneous translation. I think we are nearer to the truth if from the introductory declaration of Somadeva to his readers taking it as a whole we draw the conclusion that he on the contrary faithfully kept the arrangement of the work on which he put a Sanskrit garb *yathā mūlāṁ kathanānta na manug aya atikramat*. And perhaps the very decidedness of this profession, united with the explicit statement made in the subsequent verses, may be accounted for by his propensity to make room against his predecessor in Sanskritizing the Brhatkathā who had fallen short of his duty of making a faithful reproduction of it. As a matter of fact Ksemendra does not name the source of his Brhatkathā material. After the usual invocations his preamble is made up of this single śloka

etam kila purāṇeṣu sarvagataviddi iyaṁ
viraṣasanaśilinyam śrutau ca śrīyate katha,

1) It results from this also that in the *Petropolitan Dictionary* s v *amāya* the meaning 6) supposed for this single passage Kathās 1, 11 must be cancelled.

a mere phrase which discloses nothing as the author only affirms that the great tale he is about to narrate is not of his own invention. It is found in the Puranas and the Vedas so he says! A strange statement and a deceptive one moreover which permits us also to suppose that he took no scruple to act with his poem rather freely and according to his fancy. The resume of the books VI—XVIII (p. 617—619) which is put into the mouth of Narayana himself and which has no counterpart in the Kathasaritsagara is doubtless of his own invention.

By reasoning a priori, therefore one would be rather inclined to distrust the truthfulness of the arrangement of the lambakas of the Brihatkathamanguni. But why should we reason upon generalities while evidence of a better kind may be obtained by a close comparison of the two sets of books that make up one the redaction of Somadeva and the other that of Ksemendra? Which of them will prove to afford the better and the more congruous and consistent course of facts as far as they belong to the frame story will have the better claim to be acknowledged as representative of the original order.

The first five lambakas following each other in the same order in both poems we must begin with lamb VI. This lambaka and the next ones are thus far arranged differently that lamb VI of Somadeva is the VIIth of Ksemendra whereas lamb VIII of S corresponds to VI of K. Lamb VIII S = VI K is wholly taken up with an episode the story of Suryaprabha. The only difference is this Ksemendra subjoins it to the similar story of Çaktivega which makes up lamb V. He represents both narrations as being told by two Vidyadharas at different times to Udayana when Narayana-datta was an infant. Somadeva makes Suryaprabha narrate the story of the old Çakravartin Suryaprabha at a much later time when Narayana-datta was already married and her apparent discrepancy is of no consequence at all and does not yield any presumption in favour of either author.

But the case is different with respect to the lambaka Ratnaprabha which bears the number VII in the Kathasaritsagara = XIV of the Brihatkathamanguni. That lambaka encompasses a portion of the main story as far as it relates how Narayana-datta got his wives Ratnaprabha and Karpurika. Somadeva places the events in the earlier part of the hero's adventures. Ksemendra in a much later period, when he had gained already victories in the celestial regions had recovered his chief queen Madanamandika and was very near to be crowned emperor of all the Vidyadharas. It is not

difficult to show that Kṣ's division is not consistent with the regular course of the facts. The *Īmbika Ratnaprabhā* presupposes the heir apparent living with his father at Kauṇṭimbī and his being dependent on him, he has not yet obtained the powers of the *Vidyādhara*s, his falling in love with the *Vidyādhari Ratnaprabhā* affords the first opportunity to him to be raised into the higher spheres, his love with *Karpūrikā* concerns a human lady, and it is only by means of a mechanical implement wrought by a human magician that he passes through the air to her distant country and comes back with her home. These facts are properly put between *Īmb* „*Madanamarucukā*” (Somadeva's VI ¹), treating of how he got his first wife, and *Īmb* „*Alankāravatī*,” in which he gains his second *Vidyādhari* (Somadeva's IX) and becomes more and more familiarized with the spheres on high. But being inserted, as Kṣemendra does, after the *Īmbika* „*Pauca*” (Somadeva's XIV = Kṣ's XIII) these facts are utterly discordant. Nor is this arrangement suitable with respect to the *Īmbika* next in Kṣemendra, which is *Alankāravatī*, it destroys the natural connexion and coherence of *Īmb* „*Pauca*” and *Īmb* „*Mahābhūṣaka*” (Som's XIV and XV), the victory of the hero and his being anointed as the *Cakravartin* of the *Vidyādhara*s.

Kṣ's *Īmb* VIII is „*Velā*,” which is *Īmb* XI of Somadeva. In this book, a very short one, *Narai* obtains as his wife *Jayendrasenā* (Kṣ) or *Jayendrasenā* (Som), the sister of the two brothers who chose him to pass the judgment of their contest. By fixing the time of that marriage next to his marriage with his first queen *Madanamarucukā* Kṣemendra raises the lady to a higher rank than is consistent with the intention of the author of the *Bhṛatkathā*, who evidently considered *Ratnaprabhā*, and no other woman, as the second queen, the relation of the father to *Vāsavadattī* and *Padmāvatī* has its parallel in that of the son to *Madanamarucukā* and *Ratnaprabhā*. Here too, it is plain, Kṣemendra's arrangement of the order of events is rather anomalous.

The *Īmb* „*Pauca*” is almost entirely concerned with the frame-story. In the *Kathasaritsāgara*, of which it is the XIVth *Īmb*, it begins with the rape of *Madanamarucukā* and the desolation of her husband at her loss, the various adventures connected with his inquiries after her and the endeavours taken to release her from the hands of *Vinasavega* are narrated in this book. Kṣemendra's

¹) Som's *Īmb* VIII „*Sarjaprabhā*” is a mere episode, and does not belong to the frame story, cp. *supra*, p. 7.

XIIIth book. Pura has exactly the same contents with one exception the rape of Madanamaukikā is not told there nor could it be told at this point of the tale since this occurrence was related in an earlier portion of the tale at the conclusion of the lamb

'Vela'. In other words Ks makes Manasavegā kidnap the chief queen of Naravāhanadatta soon after his marrying his second wife whereas Som postpones the capture to a much later period of his exploits. Both the rape and the *faits et gestes* performed by the future Emperor of the Vidyadhara to recover his beloved one are related without interruption in the Kathasaritsagara within the limits of one lambika. In the Bṛhatkathamajyāi Madanamaukikā is stolen away in lamb VIII and not regained before the poem has almost completed lamb XIII. The importance of this discrepancy becomes striking if we consider that the intermediate lambikas one of which Çiṣṇakavṛti (Ks s nr IX) numbers 2435 śloka are crammed with a great mass of stories of the most various kind which intercept the main story. It is obvious even to a superficial observer that the arrangement of Somadeva is more suitable for a proper exposition of this part of the tale.

Moreover Ksemendra having the capture of Madanamaukikā at a prior time involves himself into incongruities and impairs the reputation of his hero. When the Vidyadhara Manasavegā carried her off through the air he had ravished her from her apartments in the palace of Kauṣambi. In this point both Sanskrit redactions are in accordance. Her disappearance could in no way be hidden from the father of Naravāhanadatta the lord of Kauṣambi. But in the Bṛhatkathamajyāi the rape is narrated in lamb VIII (p. 214 f.) yet it is as late as the commencement of lamb XIII (p. 150) that Udravāsa is informed of his son's distress and of his absence in search of her! ¹) Ks had forgotten that Madanamaukikā was seized at Kauṣambi from the immediate vicinity of her father-in-law.

The lamb „Çiṣṇakavṛti" which in Bṛhka — where it is in IX — is subsequent to the disappearance of Madanamaukikā opens with the nocturnal visit of Iṣṭilalocanā who carries the hero while asleep away to a fir cliff desirous of his embrace. In the mean while Naravāhanadatta awoke and seeing the beautiful heavenly maiden at his side the cunning prince pretended to be asleep

) at ā t k ā r yā a i j at prā j a i athāt a ja Pa ca
t t ā lebl e rat ātro V tsarājāt p jāsakhi t || 1 2
ta allabha i jayārta j it ā i ts vareṣ r t
t t ā a sah de it hyā gōkajalā ka arel t t ||

In cl I ha e corrected the nonsensical reading of the edited text t b l a r t

difficult to show that Ks s division is not consistent with the regular course of the facts. The lambaka Ratnaprabhā presupposes the heir apparent living with his father at Kauṣambi and his being dependent on him: he has not yet obtained the powers of the Vidyādhara; his falling in love with the Vidyādhari Ratnaprabhā affords the first opportunity to him to be raised into the higher spheres; his love with Karpurika concerns a human lady and it is only by means of a mechanical implement wrought by a human magician that he passes through the air to her distant country and comes back with her home. These facts are properly put between lamb

Madanamaruṇḍakā (Somadeva's VI) ¹) treating of how he got his first wife and lamb Alankaravṛtti in which he gains his second Vidyādhari (Somadeva's IX) and becomes more and more familiarized with the spheres on high. But being inserted as Ksemendra does after the lambaka Pura (Somadeva's XIV = Ks s XIII) the facts are utterly discordant. Nor is this arrangement suitable with respect to the lambaka next in Ksemendra which is Alankaravṛtti: it destroys the natural connexion and coherence of lamb Pura and lamb Mahabhūṣakā (Som s XIV and XV) the victory of the hero and his being anointed as the Cakravartin of the Vidyādhara.

Ks s lamb VIII is Vela which is lamb XI of Somadeva. In this book a very short one Naray obtains as his wife Jinendrasenā (Ks) or Jivendrasena (Som) the sister of the two brothers who chose him to pass the judgment of their contest. By fixing the time of that marriage next to his marriage with his first queen Madanamaruṇḍakā Ksemendra raises the lady to a higher rank than is consistent with the intention of the author of the Bīṛṭkathā who evidently considered Ratnaprabhā and no other woman as the second queen. The relation of the father to Vidyādhari and Padmavati has its parallel in that of the son to Madanamaruṇḍakā and Ratnaprabhā. Here too it is plain Ksemendra's arrangement of the order of events is rather anomalous.

The lamb Pura is almost entirely concerned with the frame story. In the Kathasabitsagara of which it is the XIVth lamb it begins with the rape of Madanamaruṇḍakā and the desolation of her husband; it tells of the various adventures connected with his inquiries after her and the endeavours taken to rid her from the hands of Manusaveta; are narrated in the book Ksemendra's

¹) Ks s lamb VIII "Suryaprabhā" is a mere episode and does not belong to the frame story of the *Samudra* 1.

XIIIth book „Pañca” has exactly the same contents, with one exception: the rape of Madanamañcukā is not told there, nor could it be told at this point of the tale, since this occurrence was related in an earlier portion of the tale, at the conclusion of the lamb „Velā” In other words: Kṣ. makes Mānasavega kidnap the chief queen of Naravāhanadatta soon after his marrying his second wife, whereas Som. postpones the capture to a much later period of his exploits Both the rape and the *faits et gestes* performed by the future Emperor of the Vidyādhara to recover his beloved one are related without interruption in the Kathāsaritsāgara, within the limits of one lambaka In the Brhatkathāmañjarī Madanamañcukā is stolen away in lamb. VIII, and not regained before the poem has almost completed lamb XIII The importance of this discrepancy becomes striking, if we consider that the intermediate lambakas, one of which „Çaṣāṅkavatī” (Kṣ’s nr. IX) numbers 2435 śloka, are crammed with a great mass of stories of the most various kind, which intercept the main story It is obvious even to a superficial observer that the arrangement of Somadeva is more suitable for a proper exposition of this part of the tale

Moreover, Kṣemendia fixing the capture of Madanamañcukā at a prior time involves himself into incongruities and impairs the reputation of his hero. When the Vidyādhara Mānasavega carried her off through the air, he had ravished her from her apartments in the palace of Kauṣāmbī. In this point both Sanskrit redactions are in accordance Her disappearance could in no way be hidden from the father of Naravāhanadatta, the lord of Kauṣāmbī But in the Brhatkathāmañjarī the rape is narrated in lamb VIII (p. 214 f.), yet it is as late as the commencement of lamb XIII (p. 450) that Ikṣvāku is informed of his son’s distress and of his absence in search of her! ¹⁾ Kṣ. had forgotten that Madanamañcukā was seized at Kauṣāmbī, from the immediate vicinity of her father-in-law

The lamb „Çaṣāṅkavatī”, which in Brhkm — where it is nr. IX — is subsequent to the disappearance of Madanamañcukā, opens with the nocturnal visit of Lalitalocnā who carries the hero while asleep away to a far off hill, desirous of his embraces In the mean while Naravāhanadatta awoke, and seeing the beautiful heavenly maiden at his side, „the cunning prince pretended to be asleep,

¹⁾ *atrantave kṣāpi yātam punah prāptam athātmaṃ
dīptā leḥhe ratim ito Vatsarājah priya akhah ||* *Brhka,*
tam vallabhānyogāntim jātā Vatsanareṣṭarah *çl 2*
l d hāta saha detibhyām rokṣāpāśamarec uah ||

In çl 2 I have corrected the nonsensical reading of the edited text *lobharatim*

and in order to test her he said, as if talking in his sleep Where are you, dear Madanaruncukā? Come and embrace me ¹⁾ Whereupon she took the form of that queen and complied to his wish Now, both authors agree about the attitude of the prince at that moment, he knows the woman who has taken him into her arms to be another than his most beloved queen but he feigns it is she, in order to prompt her to give him her caresses This agreement evidently shows, that the fact was related in this manner in their common source, the *Pañcici Brhatkatha* But how different are the circumstances in both Sanskrit redactions! Somadeva simply relates the witty trick of a wanton youth, enjoying the *bonne fortune* of a new love adventure Ksemendra strikes the reader with the disgusting heartlessness of his hero who just now was bereaved of his most beloved wife and in the acme of his grief employs her cherished name as an instrument for indulging into lasciviousness!

The foresaid considerations induce me to conclude that it was Somadeva, and not Ksemendra, who drew up the faithful reproduction of the old *Pañcici* poem That he tells sometimes the same story twice over now and then even with slight variations, may be put rather on the account of his fidelity in rendering the work he wished to preserve than on that of the 'Unachtsamkeit' fancied by Mankowski Who knows both cannot but feel convinced that negligence is not a fault of Somadeva but rather of his predecessor And for what reason should we mistrust the explicit declaration made in the opening verses of the *Kathasaritsagara*? ²⁾ On the other hand it is *a priori* to be expected that Ksemendra not having obliged himself to reproduce in a Sanskrit imitation the *Pañcici Brhatkatha* exactly and in the same order reserved and returned his freedom for change and modification according to his own taste It is in consequence of his predilection for regular schemes that the adventures and exploits of the two human persons who obtained power in the world of the *Vidyadharas* Çaktivaça and Survaprabhā are narrated in the *Brhatkathamāyā* in immediate order in two subsequent *limbikas* the same tendency induced him to put together into one body the tales of the *Pāncatantra* (p. 561—587 of the printed text), though in the poem he worked upon he found the several books separated from each other by interposed small stories of a quite different kind Here and elsewhere it is not he but Somadeva who returned the old divisions of the *Brhatkatha*

¹⁾ I quote Tawney's translation (II p. 133) of *Kathas* 65. 10

The rightness of this view is confirmed by the following fact : In several cases it is almost certain or at least probable that Ksemendra modified details which he found in the Brhatkathā if in some other source within his reach the same story was related in a somewhat different manner more conformable to his own taste. So it is well nigh proved by J. HERTEL *Ueber das Iāntrākhyana die Iāsnurische Redaction des Paucatantra*¹⁾ that his epitome of the Paucatantra (Iamb. XVI cl. 256—566) contains many indications of his having made use of that reduction of the renowned book by side with its reproduction in Guṇadhya's Brhatkathā. It is from the former work that he took the name of the town Mihilaropya (cl. 256 and 392) which is not found in Somadeva but occurs in the Iāntrākhyayika being likewise written *Miṛṭṭa*²⁾ (cp. Hertel p. 118). It is by misunderstanding the description of the spectacle afforded to the eyes of the people when the tortoise was being carried away through the air seizing with his teeth a piece of wood the ends of which were caught by two swans that Ksemendra writes *śakatiḥṭṭu* (cl. 334) — his source has *Iuṛṭṭa* *calatacīḥapranīṇa* *viyala viyala* *u* (l. 735 of Hertel's ed.) cp. Hertel p. 109. Nor is it likely that the fable of the sly jackal Caturā (cl. 348 foll.) was contained in the Brhatkathā; it is not met with in Kathasaritsagara but occurs in Iamb. I 759 foll. The same may apply to the stories of the crow and the serpent of the blue jewel and of the camel who was compelled to smother his body to the lion. Cp. also Hertel's note on p. 132.

The Vetula stories are no less popular in India than the fables of the Paucatantra. They too have come to us in many redactions. Ksemendra composing the Vetula portion of the Brhatkathā must have taken his materials not from Guṇadhya's poem alone but have availed himself also of other redactions. Certainly he took delight in the old Vetulaprameyamṣatikathas. He is more extensive in this part of his poem than he is wont to be and did not abridge them to that kind of skeleton as to which he reduced the old Paucatantra. His epitome of the Vetula tiles numbers 1203 clokas (from IX 18 p. 289 — to IX 1221 p. 385 of the edited text) whereas no more than 308 make up the sum of his Paucatantra portion. The arrangement of the tiles is slightly different in Katha and in Brhatkathā both agree as to nr. 1—4 but Ksem. nr. 5 = Som. nr. 4 Ksem. nr. 6 7 8 = Som. nr. 5 6 7 from nr. 9 they are again

¹⁾ This important dissertation (Leipzig, Teubner 1901) which contains at the oldest redaction of the Iatantra known to us is XVII nr. 5 of the *Abhandlungen der phil. hist. Klasse der königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*.

in accordance. Now, nr 5 of Kṣem is also nr 5 in Jivānanda's edition of the *Vetālaparicamṛiti*¹⁾, the story of the three fastidious brothers. After all which has been exposed above, I hold it for certain that it was Kṣemendra, and not Somadeva, who changed the order of the tales as they were extant in the *Bhātakathā*, and who modified some details. With him, Vīravara's devotion to Hari and Hara is double as expensive as in the Kathās (cp *Brhkm* p 310, 282 f with Kathās 78, 16—18), it is he who added the getting with child of Čaṣiprabhā in tale nr 15 (p 347, śl 747 and p 349 śl 760), in tale nr 17 the person of Virṭya, to whom the king avows his being in love, is not found in Kathās, in nr 18, when Candrisāmīn after submerging into the river, experiences another life existence, the events of that submarine life are full of particularities, which are not met with in the correspondent part of Kathās (cp Kathās 92, 65—67 with *Brhkm* p 367, śl 992—999) but which occur also in nr 15 of Jivānanda's edition (p 52 f), the third *vetāla*, in Kṣemendra's poem, contains likewise sundry details not found in Kathās *Vet* nr 3, and extends over 76 ślokaś (p 302, 181—308, 259). This diversity in some respects is utterly contrasting with the great conformity as to the transitions of one number of the *Vetāla* tales to another, e.g. the transition of tale nr 3 to nr 4

Brhkm p 308, śl 260

*muktattakūsam ādāya tatas tam
gatasambhramah | yayau javena
nrpatih skandhasstah so 'py
abhūṣata ||*

261 *mohah prthivīte lo' yam
taiāpi hīdi jumbhate | dustaśra-
manasamparkūd yat prāpto 'si
mahim imām ||*

262 *anayāsam hi pathēyam
yathestam kathanaṁ pathi |*

Kathās 78, 2

*labdhvā muktattakūsam tam Ve-
tulam nrçairragam | nīkampaḥ
skandham āropya tuṣṭim nda-
calat tatah ||*

3 *calantam ca tam amsastho
Vetulah so 'bravīt punah | rajan
kubhikṣor itaya kīte lo' yam
tata śramah ||*

4 *āyāse nīspale 'mṛṣmim mīelo
bata nūsti te tad imām śrau-
matas tām kathām pathi
imodimim ||*

Therefore, where this conformity is broken by Ks producing more and somewhat different details, we may as a rule suppose

¹⁾ A very late edition of an ep tome of the work, made by a certain Jaribhālālatia Č₁ UHLE in his Preface (p. VI) on his edition of *Čivadāś Vetālaparicamṛitika* (*Uth f d e k ante les Miroir des Miroirs* : d. D. Morgent Ges VIII, nr 1)

that he made use there of other sources besides the Bṛhatkathā. The old epic legend of Nala and Damayanti is told in the 56th tat of the Kathāsamitsāgara, çl 238—417, the corresponding passage in Brhkm (p 537, çl 331—540, çl 371) amounts to $\frac{2}{9}$ of its length. Yet it mentions the boons, given by the devas at Nala's marriage (çl 342), which detail is passed over by Somadeva. The very words, which Kṣ uses here

*chāyādvṛtīyam avrot parijñāya Nalam dhīyā
jñātvā devāḥ svam āharam vidhāya pradadur varām*

show that he availed himself of the original Mahābhārata tradition, too, not only of the Bṛhatkathā¹⁾ For this reason, too, he avoided to state that she saw six Nalas, as he found in the Puṣṭācī poem, contrarily to the Mhbh, the Nalopākhyāna, adhy 5, 9 has „five“ Nalas²⁾, Kṣ does not name any number at all. Nor did he find in the Bṛhatkathā, that Puṣkara was a relative to Nala, not a brother (*sagotrenatha çatrunā / kenōpi Puṣkaraākhyena*), which is also different from the Mhbh, I do not understand, for what reason he may have modified this, and am rather inclined to suspect some neglect of his part.

Another instance of Kṣemendra's freedom in handling his ground work. The story of Purūravas and Urvāçī is told in both Sanskrit versions. In the Kathās (17, 4) Purūravas is called *paramaśaśnata*, and from the whole style and spirit of the story of his adventures it is plain that the version of the Bṛhatkathā is founded on a Viṣṇuistic recension of the old myth. Kṣemendra stripped off entirely that Vaiṣṇava garb, and in his short extract (lamb III, 114—123) he purposely does not even mention the name of Viṣṇu, though this god plays an *essential* part in the story as told by Somadeva.

Elsewhere Kṣemendra, who loved to show his learning, gratifies himself in additional ornaments of a rather ostentatious character. If such accessories are not found at all in the parallel passages of Kathās and at the same time display that the poet was well read in the great epics and the purāṇa literature, it is likely that he has added them of his own. Of the kind is this Bhīmabhrata is

¹⁾ The force of this argument will be felt by every one who, perusing the Nala episode in the Kathās, observes how much its composer strove to keep a wording different from that of the famous epic tale.

²⁾ In Kathās 56, 200—280 the narration of the wooing of Damayanti by the Devas is a paraphrase of the simpler account in Mhbh. It differs in this, that *five* lokajñās, not *four*, come up to the svayamvara, Vāyu being added to Indra, Agni, Varuna and Yama, see çl 261.

changed into an elephant owing to a curse of a hermit whom he had treated with contempt. In Kathās (74, 305) that hermit's name Uttanka is simply mentioned, nothing more. Kṣemendra does not omit to identify him with the Uttanka of the Ādiparva of the Mhbh (see p. 286, § 872).

To infer from all this that whosoever, with respect to the contents of the corresponding tales, Kṣemendra is at variance with Somadeva, he has modified them either from other sources or by his own invention, would be, however, a very hasty conclusion and rather an untruth. Since both abridged a voluminous ground-text independently, it cannot have failed to happen that some details passed over by one were drawn up by the other, even while taking into account that the result of Kṣemendra's condensing effort was the production of a poem much smaller than that of Somadeva.¹⁾ BÜHLER, in his first article mentioned above p. 11, demonstrated already that variance in particularities may, and in some cases, must be explained so. I may point to the fact that Kṣemendra avoids more than the author of Kathās introducing anonymous persons, he has a childish liking for the proper names of the *dramatis personae* of his numerous tales, nor is it anything rare with him that, within shorter limits, he mentions names of secondary persons not found in the corresponding parties of Somadeva.²⁾

Recapitulating, we may state as the main result of the comparison of the two Sanskrit redactions this, that Somadeva's poem may be considered to give a faithful representation of the old Pañcālī Brhatkathā, but that on the other hand the differences between him and Kṣemendra are not always to be imputed to the latter having contaminated the tradition of the Brhatkathā with truths and

¹⁾ So it is impossible that the details of the story told Brhm p. 406, § 17-58 but passed over Kathās 123, 310, did not belong to the Brhatkathā. In Kathās 100-68 it is simply said that it was in her old father's hermitage that Vegavati succeeded in getting the *utijas*, delegated to her by her brother, Brhm p. 403, § 41-49 contains a detailed account how this came to happen. Whence else could Kṣ draw this than from the Brhatkathā? And the agreement mentioned by Kṣem (§ 168 § 122) *lāsiti prajāntīdam na rājinn itī vāpīlā*, as it is doubtless an essential feature of the story of Suena and Rambhā, goes back to the Pañcālī original, though Kṣem did not retain it in his version (t. 28, 60 foll).

²⁾ To give a few instances out of a large list Kṣ names — Som not — the mother of Rutahī, the yogini who taught the pseudo-līlā savali an incantation against the fever demon, the wife of Jimutāceta the king of Ujjayini in the preamble of the story of Nisavadata, the maiden whom Ivaracarman married at last Cf. Brhm p. 31, 194-216, 380-311, 708-481, 103-517, 79 with Kathās 70, § 71, 307-60, 6-9-37, 17, 17. A remarkable name is that of the captain of the ship Parbara it does not occur in Somadeva's relation of the sleeping nixie (t. 26, 77 foll).

particulars taken from other redactions of the same stories or to his having given free play to his own fancy. Sometimes he may have done so, yet he kept sometimes peculiarities originally belonging to the Brhatkātha which Somadeva left aside. Sound inquiry must decide thereabout in each separate case, not rarely, I fear, its conclusion will be a *non liquet*. But, be this as it may, there is not the least reason to distrust the categorical declaration of the author of the Kathasāritsāgarā, that his shortened Brhatkāthā in Sanskrit is the faithful reproduction of the Puṣpācī poem, without detracting or adding to its contents. It was he who kept the original order of the lambālas and not Kṣemendīna. The different arrangement of the latter is to be ascribed to some caprice. And so the final conclusion of our general inquiry tends to confirm if not to enlarge the value of the Kathasāritsāgarā as the trustworthy testimony of that immense mass of fairy tales which was collected many centuries before the eleventh A. D. and as a faithful picture of Indian society at the time, when that collection was made.

In 1893 the existence of a third Sanskrit *samgraha* of the Brhatkāthā was made known. The pundit Hara Prasad Shastri in an article of the *Journal of the As. Soc. of Bengal* (LXII, 215 foll.) gave an account of the contents of a MS. he had received through the good offices of some friend from Nepal among a collection of old and fragmentary Sanskrit literary documents. That MS. nr. 12 of his list was labelled as unknown but on examination he discovered it to be a portion of a Sanskrit redaction of the Brhatkāthā much different from both Somadeva's and Kṣemendīna's and in his opinion a more extensive work than even the former of both. To give an idea of the length of the whole he noticed that the first *adhyaaya* alone distributed over 26 *sargas* has more than 1200 *ślokas*, which portion he estimated about a tenth of the whole work. It is not divided so he said into *lambikās* and *taṅgaś* but into *adhyaayas* and *sargas*. He added in full the colophons of the different *sargas* extant in the fragment he had discovered. This valuable statement must be corrected in one point, as has been observed by Dr. Hertel, in the Preface of his edition of the meridional redaction of *Pāncitratna* 1) p. VII—VIII. Hara Prasad had misunderstood the meaning of *adhyaaya* occurring but once and without the addition of *prallāpa* in the colophons. Our fragment knows no other division but into *sargas*.

1) *Abh. de Soci. des. Et. Ind. Asiat. de Paris*, t. XXIV, nr. 5.

the word *adhyāya* is not the name of some portion of the poem. The title of the whole, as found in the colophons, is *Brhatkathāyām ślokaśamgraha* = „the abstract in ślokas (called) *Brhatkathā*”

Five years after, Sylvain Lévi returning from Nepal took to Paris another manuscript of the same work, more exactly speaking, a second MS which contains a portion of the text, brought into light by Hara Prasād, śarga 1—10 out of the 26. Though this acquisition did not extend the compass of the remnants of the third Sanskrit *Brhatkathā*, it drew the attention to that work. One of Lévi's pupils, M. FRÉDÉRIC LACÔTE, to whom he intrusted the study of it and in whose behalf he obtained the loan of the Calcutta MS described by Hara Prasād, is now preparing an edition. He has already published in original and translation the first śarga in the *Journal Asiatique* of 1906 (Janv.—Févr. p. 22 foll.) and in the general account he gives of the work, he fully subscribes to the judgment of the first discoverer: „Nous avons affaire à un poème complètement différent”, if compared with the common source of the two Kashmirian abbreviators. As far as may be inferred from the fragment available, not only „la disposition des matières”, but also „en grande partie, les matières mêmes sont tout autres”. The first śarga certainly has a content not found at all in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* nor in the *Brhatkathā-mañjarī*, and even not consistent with what is related in a few ślokas of *Kathīs* (111, 81. 90—93) about Gopīlakṣ's abdication and depart to the forest. And the examination of the colophons communicated by Hara Prasād sometimes brings us in contact with names and facts known from *Kathas* and *Brhm*, as the story of Pingalika (*Kathās* t. 21), the hero's marriage with Vegavatī and Gandhīvadattī (*Kathās* I. 105 and 106), sometimes on the contrary we meet with persons not occurring there, as Pūyadarśanā, the lady whose name is found in the colophons of śarga 20 and 22—26.

Further, M. Lacôte observes that the whole plan of composition of the „*Brhatkathā ślokaśamgraha*” is quite different. „Il ne se compose pas d'une collection de contes variés. Le souci de l'ordre et de la composition y est évident, le sujet y est exactement limité, sans doute les héros y racontent des histoires, mais ce sont contes, sinon brefs, du moins étroitement liés à l'action et mieux fondus dans le récit” (II p. 31).

M. Lacôte proposes to take up the question of the interrelation of the two different *Brhatkathās* together with his edition of the *ślokaśamgraha*. We for our part, as we are dealing with the *Brhat-*

kāthā as the source of the Kathāsaritsāgāra, and since there can be no doubt as to which redaction of the Bṛhatkāthā underlies the poems of Somaśrī and Kṣemendra, leave this point awaiting for the rest with great interest the results of Lacôte's investigations. In the following Chapter, however, the nature of the facts and questions examined there, will oblige us to make known our preliminary opinion about that interrelation, as far as it has been fixed by the data as yet available.

CHAPTER III

THE BRHATKATHA ITS DATE AND ITS AUTHOR

When was the Brhatkatha composed?

The question is answered differently by competent scholars. WIEBER in the 2^d ed. of his *Indische Literaturgeschichte*, in 1876 said hesitatingly (p. 229, n. 224) 'aus etwa dem sechsten (?) Jahrhund.' BÜHLER in his *Detailed Report of a Tour in Kashmir* which appeared one year after, peremptorily pronounced 'Gunâdhya's Vrihatkathâ goes back to the first or second century of our era.' SYMAON LEE in his *Theatre indien* 1891 (p. 317 at the bottom) preferred a date between both limits but nearer to that fixed by Bühler. L'auteur de la Brhatkathâ puçacî qui vivait avant la fin du VI^e siècle (Subindhu le cite à cette époque) et probablement au III^e.) And a few years ago VINCENT A. SMITH in an article on *Andhra History and Coinage* in the *Zeitschr. d. D. Morgenl. Ges.*, concluded that the original Brhatkatha in the Pūṣṭhī Dialect the Saptasatī in Mithrastrī and the Katantrī grammar are all to be referred to the approximate date, 60 or 70 A.D. (*DMG LVI*, 660). So the work the reputed author of which is Gunâdhyā is assigned to dates, ranging over a period of five centuries.

The *terminus ante quem* is not uncertain. It is a matter of fact that Bṛh̥, who quotes the Brhatkatha in the preamble of his *Harsacarita*, lived in the first part of the seventh century. Also that Subindhu who wrote the *Vaṇadatta* precedes Bṛh̥ in time. He too alludes more than once at the Brhatkatha. Placing his lifetime as is usually done in the sixth century, the necessary inference is this, that our Pūṣṭhī poem was renowned at a date nearly contemporaneous with Juṭinim.

As to the *terminus ex quo* this cannot at any rate be placed before the beginning of our era. The original Brhatkatha must be posterior to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana Vāmanac by several centuries. The persons of both grammarians occur in the main stories of the

*) In 1900 the same scholar prefers the 2^d century, see his *Le Neps I* II. 63.

first lambaka, the Kathāpitha, where Vararuci is no other than the guru Paśpadanta in his human existence, to which he had been condemned by a curse (vid *supra*, p 1) The fabulous things told about him are so wonderful that at the first acquaintance with the Kathāsaritsāgara it was universally accepted that there must be a considerable space of time between the age of the real Vararuci and the putting to writing of the legendary stories recorded in the Kathāpitha. Nobody, therefore, has ventured to assign to the Pañcāci poem any earlier date than the first century A D Bühler, whose high authority makes his statement (1st or 2^d century) be accepted by most scholars¹⁾, came to this conclusion upon general considerations, it seems Vincent A Smith, circumscribing the time of its composition within the limits of the third quarter of the first century A D, follows this line of argument. His starting point is the Udayagiri rock inscription of king Kharavela of Kalinga, dated of the 165th year of the Maurya era. We learn from it that in 168 B C that monarch was assisted by his ally Çatukani [or Sītikanini] whose realm was in the West — *abhitāyita Satākani pachimadīsam*²⁾. By combining other epigraphical and literary data (ZDMG, 11 p 653 foll.) it may be inferred that the Çatukani dynasty who reigned over the Andhra state west of Kalinga, was established 220 B C and lasted until the middle of the second century A D. Since the oldest Purāṇas especially the Vāyu and the Matsya, contain lists of the Andhra kings with the number of years of their reigns it is easy to find by computation that Hāla, the 18th of the Matsya purāṇa list, must have acceded in or about 68 A D according to the Matsya and in or about 51 A D, according to the Vāyu Purāṇa (ibid p 659)³⁾. This Hāla, also known by his other name Satavahana⁴⁾, is that monarch who is 'credited by tradition with the patronage of three important literary works' the anthology of Mahūrāṣṭri stanzas, known

¹⁾ See e.g. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakritsprachen*, § 29, Macdonnell, *Sanskrit Literature* p 376.

²⁾ Cf. BHARGAVANĀTH INDRĀNIS paper in the *Actes du 6^e Congrès International des Orientalistes* (Congress of Leiden) espec p 146.

³⁾ Vincent A Smith quotes, not from the text of the Mat-sya-purāṇa, but from Radcliff's testimony. The list is found in ch 273. In the edition, I have at hand, brought into light by care of Pa cinna Tarkaratna (Calcutta, 1890), neither the number of the kings, nor their names and the length of their reigns do fully agree with the list as published in ZDMG, 11. As long as we do not possess critical editions of the most prominent Purāṇas, it should not be lost of sight, that the exactness of their data needs requires philological test before using them.

⁴⁾ I follow the spelling of PW and of Durgapriya in his ed. of the Kathas. Smith spells Satavāhana.

as Hāla's *Sattasāī*, the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇādhyā, who was minister of *Sātavāhana*, and the *Kātantra* whose author *Carvavarmān* is recorded to have been another minister of the same king. Taking his conclusion, Smith infers that the three works are contemporaneous and must be placed about 60—70 A. D.

The argument is specious indeed, but I think it is rather weak by its onesidedness. If its inventor had considered also the literary side of the problem, more than one objection would have presented itself to his mind. WEBER, in the preface on his edition of the *Sattasāī*, which appeared in the *Abhandl.* of the *Deutsche Morgenl. Ges.* (VII, nr. 4. Ueber das *Saptasatākam* des Hāla) demonstrated from words as *horā* = *होरा*, *angarāvāra* = *अंगरावरा*, and some words of Persian origin occurring in that work, that it is impossible to place the collection which bears the name of *Sātavāhana* before the 3^d century of our era, and expressed as his own opinion that it is rather to be ascribed to a later time, of course before *Bṛha* (7th cent.) who praised the anthology in the preamble of his *Harṣacarita*. He who holds a different opinion is bound to infirm the strong arguments put forward in that dissertation. Vincent A. Smith did not so, and I greatly doubt how he should be able to prove an as early date as he does of a collection of verses, in which *hora* and *angarāvāra* are used as they are.

Then, if the *Pāṇini* tongue belongs to the North-western border of India, as is the opinion of Grierson, it looks strange that the birthplace of a standard work of enormous size in that dialect is sought for in a country at so great a distance from those regions. As easy as it is to understand that a ruler of Maratha land passes for the reputed author of the famous anthology of *Maharīstri* poetry¹⁾, is little advisable is it to believe in an historical basis of the legendary account of *Sātavāhana* acting as the propagator of Guṇādhyā's poem. Though no work in *Pāṇini* has come to us, that language must have had a considerable literature. WASILJEW

¹⁾ GARRET, in his compte rendu of a former article of Weber on the *Saptasatāka* in *Journal Asiatique* Ser. 8, t. XX, 1899, says of the tradition that it is trustworthy as far as, elle attribue une collection de poésies mal irasītrī à un roi des Malīnastṛa.

As to the historical foundation of that tradition I quote with my full assent the following words of the same scholar (p. 199). „Hāla, d'après le témoignage unanime du lexicographe Hemacandra, des commentateurs, de Colebrooke et de Phan Dīji est un nom de Śaivabāha ou Śaivābāha, ce qui n'oblige certainement pas à admettre sans contrôle que ce personnage aussi légendaire qu'historique ait effectivement recueilli ou fait recueillir les vers en question", and ibid. p. 207. „Sans accepter cette identification [of Hāla and Śaiva] comme un fait historique, nous avons le droit d'y voir l'expression de l'opinion des Indiens, opinion qui a ni plus ni moins de valeur que celle qui rattache à Vikramāditya les œuvres les plus célèbres de la littérature sanskrite."

records in his work on Buddhism (p. 295 of the German translation, cp. *ibid.* p. 226, n. 3) from Tibetan sources that one of the chief schools of the Vaibhāṣikas, the Sthāviras employed the Paṣācī. If we consider that Buddhism flourished in the regions, where Paṣācī seems to be at home, this testimony seems to be trustworthy. If the legend about Guṇādhyā being compelled by his vow to use that tongue teaches us anything real, it is this that the Paṣācī was not considered a current language within India proper. In no other way may it be explained that Guṇādhyā, taking the vow of *mauna*, if Śaivavarman succeeded to make a learned man out of the ignorant king in a minimum of time, engaged himself to never more use any of the three languages Sanskrit, Pāli, Apabhraṃṣa, excluding the fourth, the Paṣācī. Apparently, in the mind of the composer of the tale that language is considered a foreign tongue. This remark makes it more than doubtful that a Mahārāṣṭra king should have anything to do with the composition of the Paṣācī *Bṛhatkathā*. It is not an old historical tradition but the popularity of his name, that fathered on him its first lambika.

Further, assuming for a moment that Vincent A. Smith is right taking the *Kathāpithi* for a document of some historical value, be it even so little, and also right in his fixation of the reign of the Andhra king Hāla = Śātavāhana in the time of the emperor Nero, I wonder how he did not realize the enormous anachronisms effected by combining this double evidence. The Śātavāhana of the *Bṛhatkathā*, king of the country Pratiṣṭhāna, the capital of which is Supraṭiṣṭhita¹⁾, being coeval with the last Nandas and Candragupta, belongs accordingly to the end of the IVth century B.C. That he must be a contemporary of them is a necessary inference from what is narrated in the *Kathāpithi*. Puṣpadanta-Vaśaruci and Mālyavanta-Guṇādhyā were cursed *together*, they commenced their human existence *at the same time*. Now, Vaśaruci was the minister of the last Nanda, Guṇādhyā of Śātavāhana. Ergo the legendary last Nanda and his destroyer Candragupta are placed in the same time as the legendary king Śātavāhana, born out of a lioness and made by adoption son to king Dipakarna. But the historical persons of that name are separated in Vincent A. Smith's own chronology by at least three centuries and a half. Considering, then, the so-called data of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* somewhat more closely, we sink again „in the quicksands of Sanskrit literary history,” to use the image

¹⁾ See *Kathās* 6, 8 *Pratiṣṭhāne 'stī nājanāni Sūratisthita saṃyākalani*.

of Vincent A Smith himself (*ZMDG* I I p 660) and have no resting-place I pass over the difficulty that the names of the predecessor of the legendary and the historical Sātavāhana disagree (Dīpakarm and Rikṭavarna¹) [*Matsyapur adhy* 273, ṣl 9]], as this point is of minor importance

Therefore, we are constrained to place the book which records the miraculous things related about Sātavāhana and pretends to be composed by Sātavāhana himself (Kathās 8, 37) in a very long time after the historical Sātavāhana Placing this king as Vincent A Smith does, in the third quarter of the 1st century A D, it will be impossible to claim for the Kathāpīṭha, and consequently, for the Brhāt-kathā a date earlier than the third century of our era, the date fixed by Sylvain Lévi

This much we have got from the Kathāpīṭha But other useful intelligence is to be found in other parts of the great poem hitherto unobserved or forgotten, I believe, with the help of which the approximate date may be settled somewhat more exactly Bühler's estimation must certainly be given up

First of all I remind of the important fact that in the Īmbikā Ratnaprabhā (VII of Som, XIV of Ksem) there is a miraculous story about the great Nāgārjuna (Kathās 41, 9—58, Brhkm p 500, ṣl 392—407) That it is the famous Buddhist theologian of that name and no other who is the hero of the tale is palpable as well by his being styled *Bodhisattvācāmasambhava* (Kathās 41, 10) as by the nature of his exploits The historical Nāgārjuna belongs doubtless to a later period than the Sātavāhana of Vincent A Smith KERN, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p 118, places him ± 150 A D, Tīranāthi treats of his deeds and his immense knowledge after completing his relation of Kāṁśka and the Third Council, at which time Buddhist tradition places the birth of Nāgārjuna Arguing as before and leaving ever so much room for the promptness of devotees to endow the divine master and Bodhisattva, as they will have considered him already during his lifetime, with miraculous and superhuman powers, yet the extremely wonderful story told about him presupposes a distance of time of at least one century Accordingly, our *terminus ex quo* for the date of the Brhāt-kathā advances to the latter half of the third century A D at the utmost, and it begins to be likely that its composition cannot be dated before 300 A D

¹ I find the name in the printed text, mentioned *supra* Balchiff, who is the source of Smith, names this king Gorakṣasāṁgri or Gaurakṣa, Naurakṣa, Vikṣa. We have here a fair sample of how much MSS may disagree in Paurāṇik texts!

The big *lambikā Cṛcāṅkavatī* which contains little short of 5000 ślokaś in *Kathās* and almost half of that number in *Bhāṣā* is for its greater part made up of the romantic adventures of *Migāṅkadatta*, the prototype, as is commonly believed, of the plot of *Dandin's Daṣṭakumārācārītā*. *Migāṅkadatta* is the son of the *Ayodhyā* king *Amaraḍatta*. Him his father banished from his realm at the instigation of his first minister who falsely accused the prince of sorcery, alleging him to be by his incantations the cause of an attack of cholera which had befallen the king. What moved that first minister to act so? He bore a grudge to *Migāṅkadatta*. Some time before, the prince „while walking about on the top of his palace, spit down some beteljuice. And as ill luck would have it, it fell on the head of his father's minister, who happened to be walking below, unseen by the prince" 1) This essential feature of the story is told in precisely the same way in both *Sanskrit* redactions, it belongs doubtless to the original *Bṛhatkathā*.

Now, prof KARV more than twenty years ago made the observation that the habit of betel-chewing must have been introduced in the land of the Hindoos in a time, which roughly taken may be determined between Cūṭika and Saṅgita. „It appears from Jātaka (ed. Fausb.) II, 320, that at the time of the redaction of the prose commentary the habit of chewing betel existed already. No such use of betel ever occurs in the older parts of the Buddhistical canonical books, as the Mahā- and Cullavagga nor is it found neither in the Mahābhāṣita, Rāmāyaṇa, Cūṭika where it could not have been passed over tacitly, if existing. The use of tūmbulā is mentioned only with authors of the sixth century of our era, unless Saṅgita is to be placed some time before²⁾. Here I must remind that Cūṭika is reputed to have been the physician of king Kamska. Further that *tumbula* as a Pāli word is quoted by Childers from the Mahāvaṃsa. Moreover, a similar allusion is to the use of betel as stated

¹⁾ I quote from Tawney's translation of the *Katils* II, 147. The original, t. 70
5 C 14 as follows:

Ի տկձևն ընդս 5 չ'կ' 1500 լի տոնոն Լարնայի տնտեսի
 Մյոսի առևտրի խանութն առնուածն յաճախ ॥
 Եւ զայն յառնու յարժէքն Լուսնի տոյնն քանտնոյն

Isamenlra relates the same fact p 229 gl 172, thus

tat) k'elucit ta n'ahija lisa i larmjuekha ut
M₂ ju kahtutis tithijja sva ipati si xiantroni h

According to his habit, he is eager to communicate to his readers the name of that minister, Vinavavant (cl 17b). Somadeva omits it Cf. *vyāsa*, p. 49 note 2.

²⁾ I have translated this quotation from the original Dutch, see *Klein I Jhrge tot de verklaring van eenig wro ten in I di geschriften voorkomende* p 1 Cp also *Weyer, In tische Streifen* II, 50

above, is recognizable, too, in the Avadānaśataka if compared with the Avadānamālā, which contain paraphrases of edifying tales belonging to the Avadānaśataka.¹⁾ The use of the betel after dinner is regular in those younger texts, but it is never mentioned in the older work which has been paraphrased by them. The strength of the argumentum ex silentio is unimpeachable here, for the *same* relations of dinners offered to Buddha the Lord are without betel in the Avadānaśataka and with betel in the Avadānamālā.

Applying, then, the criterion of the *tumbula* to our inquiry after the date of composition of the Bṛhatkathā, the story of Migāṅkadatta can scarcely have been invented, or at least have been put on the form in which it is related in the Great Tale, before the fourth century A.D. at the lowest rate. And taking into account that this whole episode of Migāṅkadatta is not an invention of the composer of the Bṛhatkathā, but that he included it within his compilation, that, therefore, it must have existed already as an independent composition in his days — we will not be far from truth, I believe, concluding from this that the Bṛhatkathā itself can be placed by no manner before the fifth century.

The strength of this reasoning is supported by another consideration. Bṛha in the preface of his Harśacand, praisingly names the great authors in whose steps he ventures to tread. He extols as models of excellent poetry in eight ślokaś as many renowned works among them the Vasavadattā (of Subhadrin), Śāntavāḥana's (= Hāla's) anthology, the Setubandha, the works of Kālidāsa, the nāṭakas of Bhāsa, and also our Bṛhatkathā. The works he admires are both Sanskrit and Prākṛit compositions, and the tone and spirit of this whole passage reminds of the *prastāvanā* of the Mālavikāgnimitra, in which young Kālidāsa appeals to the sound judgment of his audience for his literary debut. For this purpose it is not to be expected that he will have taken the standard authors and classical works he praises from so remote antiquity. There can scarcely be allowed a larger track of time between the oldest of them and his own days than two centuries. He does not name Valmiki, and Vyāsa he addresses in quite another connection, in the solemn invocation of deities and rsis, which according to custom opens his book. His naming, then, of the Great Tale, the hero of which is Naravāṇadatta, the God of Love born again, not only proves the

¹⁾ See my paper „Fenige handels van avalanas, stichtelyke verhalen der Noordelyke Bidhisten (Versl en Medel der Kon Akad v Wet Afd Iett, IVde Reeks dl III)

existence of the Bihatkathī about 600 A D, something beyond discussion, but also makes it probable that the date of its composition cannot be too much remote from that limit.

The date settled, however roughly in this manner will prove useful in its consequences. We obtain by it also some evidence for the time of composition of the *Mudrarakṣasā*.

In Kathās t 60 the contents of which are identical with those of *Pancatantra* Book I the following śloka occurs (119 ed B₁ = 118 ed Durg)

*diṇayoḥ dattapadaḥ su ca tayoḥ neclitayoḥ cala¹)
*na caknoti evam śīhatum dhīmatam ekaṁ vimūḥcate**

= , The helle (*cala*) goddess [*su* refers to *Crī* named in the preceding śloka], if she places her feet at the same time upon two exalted persons, cannot keep her footing long, she will certainly abandon one of the two (*Lewney's transl II, 31*). This sentence is a free imitation of a tristubh of Viṣṇubhadra, the author of the *Mudrarakṣasā*. It is found in the Fourth Act of that drama (p 116 of *Majumdar's Series* ed = p 179 ed *Limbik Telang*)

atyucchite mantram pūthive ca
viślabhya padau upatiśthate Crik
su śīṣṭabharat asaka bhavasya
tayoḥ diṇayoḥ ekataram jahati

= If *Crī* [= *Fortuna Regia*] has to attend a king with a very exalted minister she must take hold on them with her stretched feet placed from another but owing to her womanhood being too weak to keep them she will (soon) abandon one of the two.

Now this self-same tristubh is met with in the *śānti* *khyanika* (I, 56) that is the oldest redaction of the *Pancatantra* come down to us and it occurs there at the same point of the tale, yet at the same point of the conversation of *Damaśaka* and *Pingalaka*, where *Somadeva* puts his free imitation of the stanza. Dr Hertel in his edition of the *śānti* *khyanika* -, has shown that there exists a close connection between that text and the

Pāncatantra portion of the *Bṛhatkathā* ¹⁾ It follows from this that the double fact of the identity of the *Mudrārākṣasa* tristubh with *Tantrākhy* I, 56 and of the occurrence of the anuṣṭubh imitative of it in *Somaśeva*'s poem at the very place where its prototype is met with in *Tantrākhy* cannot be the effect of chance. This alternative may be stated a priori either *Viçikṣadatta* borrowed the stanza from *Panc* respectively from the same authority as *Panc* did, or that oldest recension of *Panc* is younger than the *Mudrārākṣasa*. As to the former member of the alternative, it is expressly stated in *Tantrākhy* that the stanza is a quotation (*sādhucitatā nyate*). So it becomes very improbable that *Viçikṣadatta* took it from *Panc*. Nor is it likely that he took it from any other text. Every one who reads over the scene of *Mudr*, in which the stanza is found, will feel convinced that both the contents and the wording of it are in perfect agreement with the peculiar situation of the context and must have their *original home* there. Hence it follows that *Viçikṣadatta* and his admirable drama are to be placed many centuries earlier than is generally done for a stanza from it was quoted in even that redaction of *Panc*, which was taken up in the *Bṛhatkathā*. Since the *Bṛhatkathā* must have been composed ± 400 A.D., the date of the *Mudrārākṣasa* is needs to be put at least one generation before that time.

WILSON, as is known was induced by the *bharataṭakya* commemorating Allecchis as a cause of fear to India to postpone its composition to the times of the great Mohammedan invasions, still WILSON (*Ind. Literaturg.* ² 224 n. 218) believed it to be „aus etwa dem zwölften Jahrhundert". Subsequent scholars were well aware that neither the spirit of the drama nor the relations and conditions of society and religion as represented in it were suitable to a so late time, but the complete absence of any datum fit for serving as a point of starting to research, and the prejudice of Wilson's estimation which dominated in their minds prevented them from modifying his statement otherwise than by abating it a little and a little. JACOB in the second volume of the *Wiener Zeitschrift* very cleverly calculated even the date of the first representation of the *Mudrārākṣasa* Dec. 2 of 860 A.D. — but his premises were false, MACDONALD put the *terminus ante quem* on about 800 (*Hist. of Sanskr. Lit.* p. 365). Kishināth Trimbak Telang in his

¹⁾ In that recension of the *Panc* which is known as the Southern one and which takes its origin from the *Tantrākhy*, the stanza is likewise found with some modifications. See *Das 5. Uche Pañcatantra*, herausgegeben von J. HERTZ — *quintessenza*, p. 41, note 1 — p. 13.

edition of the play pleaded for the conclusion that it belongs to somewhere about the early part of the eighth century A D (p XXXI). But I think I have proved that it is by four or five centuries older and must rank with the *Micchilati* as the two most ancient plays of the Hindu theatre come to us. Both dramas are ascribed to authors about whom almost nothing is known but their name Çudrakā bears even a somewhat mythical character. Viçikhaḍḍita whose father and paternal grandfather are named in the prologue of his play may have been a historical person but no tradition whatever concerning him does exist. This is wholly consistent with his belonging to a very ancient time.

I am inclined to suppose that the Çandra Gupta named in the *Mañaratākya* of Mudra may be in allusion to some prince of that name who belonged to the dynasty of the Guptas. He who is eulogized in that final stanza is a successful protector against the threatening *Mlechchhas* may be Çandra Gupta I the founder of the new and national dynasty who lived in the beginning of his glorious descendant Çandra Gupta II at the end of the fourth century. It would be no matter of wondering it if the brilliant exploits especially of the first Çandra Gupta who subverted a secular domination of barbarians in the N and N W parts of India had prompted the unknown poet Viçikhaḍḍita to glorify a similar establishment of a mighty national monarchy by the name of his king and by his famous minister. This hypothesis which is in congruity with the line of argument I have followed when proceeding from the trustworthy stanza common to *Mudra* and *Āmṛitabhāṣya* is not contradicted by the style and language of the play. The style is characterized by its relative simplicity the diction is exquisite and some lexicological facts may indicate an ancient date of its composition. I g the use of *śarīra* = body in the forged letter (Act V) *śarīraśatamāna* is only met with in Buddhist Sanskrit texts of the first centuries A D and is therefore not registered in the Petrop Dictionary of *parāṇa* (Act III, st 10) = 'religious festival' perhaps of *śarāṇa* — not mentioned in the Petrop Dict — Act III st 11 see Kashinath's ed p 121 with commentary¹⁾

By the bye I remark that it is highly improbable that Viçā

¹⁾ I am somewhat uncertain about *kalita* (Act I st 15). If the edited text is *kalita* this word, which is always a synonym of *śāśa* *śāśa* *śāśa* and may also mean *śāśa*, has here the meaning of family in the largest sense. In this case it is very probable that this word may be reckoned an archaism. But I greatly doubt the correctness

khadatta, as Sylvain Lévi affirms (*Le théâtre indien*, p. 226), borrowed the subject matter of his *nutaka* from the Brhatkathā „cette source inépuisable” In the poems of Somadeva and Kṣemendra the sole fact of Candragupta's overturn of the Nandas is narrated and in a very concise way, but the events that happened after Candragupta's vengeance and his triumph and conquest of the royalty are not mentioned, nor does the name of Rakasa anywhere occur. If anything is certain, it is this that Viṣṭkhadatta did *not* borrow the plot of his drama from the Brhatkathā.

After this digression going back to the main subject of this disquisition, we will bring forth now some indications of various kind leading in the same direction to fix the date of the Brhatkathā about \pm 400 A.D. They may also afford some basis for further investigation. For this reason they are put forward. Their demonstrating power, if considered separately, is perhaps not so great but combined, they may help to strengthen the reasoning exposed in the foregoing.

1 The historical tradition of the foundation of Pataliputra must have been fully overgrown with legendary accounts and even wholly forgotten at the time when the Brhatkathā was composed. Passing over the well known marvellous story of the origin of the famous capital of the Mauryas as it is narrated in Kathīs 13 and Brhkm p. 10—12, I remark that the author of our collection of tales makes Vasantika and Lipantika tell stories of events happened in former days (*prāk*) at Pataliputra (see Kathīs 17—64 cp Brhkm p. 79 śl 136 and Kathīs 57—25 cp Brhkm p. 541, śl 12). In the mind of him who wrote down this, the new capital of Magadha, of a relatively recent date, is spoken of as existing already long before Udayana who is reputed coeval with the Buddha, just as Kubdasa (Raghuv. 6, 24) supposes Pataliputra is existing in the days of Rāghu and Ayā.

2 The name of the country Nepal is found in the Brhatkathā. It occurs in the fifteenth tale of the Vetāl Kathīs 89, 3 and Brhkm 315, śl 718. As far as I know, the name of Nepal is mentioned the first time in the documents available in the beginning of the 1st century A.D. It is not met with in Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa. Cp. S. L. L. Lévi, *Le Népal* II, 61—63.

unnecess of the transcribed wording because *simpatsa* + *capita* can hardly be accounted for the locatives are superfluous and would better be wanting.

I would rather think the 4th pāda of the stanza must be read thus *śeṭhityānripitēh kīlāt im śarāt simpatsa cā itśa ca* „these servants are (like) another wife in both prosperity and adversity”

3 The Bihatkathā knows still *dināas* as pieces of money. In the tale of Viravama the daily salary of that loyal warrior is five hundred *dināas*. In the Kathās this is related both times, for the story is told twice over in t 53 and t 78 (cp 53, 92 with 78 [= Vetāla 1], 11). Ksemendia, in his set of Vetālastories, instead of *dināaṣaṭapañcākam* expresses the amount of his wages in rupels *sada pañca pradyantam vijākāṇām ṣaṭāni me* (p 310, cf 279), his parallel of the Viravama tale as narrated in Kathās t 53 being exceedingly short (vide p 325), the salary is not even mentioned there. It is plain that Somadeva's *dināas*, not Ksemendia's *rupakas*, represent the coinage as given in the original Bihatkathā. In the eleventh century there was nothing that might induce an author to replace *rupala* by *dināa*, the name of an obsolete coin, but there must have been a strong bias to put *rupaka*, the name of a coin in ordinary use, instead of the antiquated *dināa*.¹⁾ The coin named *dināa* is mentioned in inscriptions of the 5th century and even later, see *Journ. of the Roy. As. Soc.* 1906, p 691.

4 In Kathās 37, 36 foll. the name of the 'Tājiks occurs. It is not absolutely certain that Somadeva found that name in his original, for Ksemendia in the parallel place (Bāhuk p 182) is silent about them. With him, it is Turuskas and Chinās who overpowered and captured Niṣcavadatta and his comrades, not Tājiks, as with Somadeva. The latter does not name at all the Chinās, he names one Turuska, viz. the king Muravāra, to whose presence the captives are brought. I hold it for probable that Somadeva is here as usual nearer to the original. Now, it should be kept in mind that the Turks, who are doubtless meant with the name of Turuskas, appear for the first time in history in the sixth century. NORRICK, in his *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabari* p 53 note remarks that „it was not before the time of the Sasanide Chosroes I that the Turks became dangerous neighbours of the Persians. It is, however, possible, not to say likely, that they occupied already in the fourth and fifth centuries regions continuous with the eastern and northern frontier of the Persian monarchy. In that case there would be nothing strange in the fact that an Indian work of the 5th century should relate of an Indian merchant, taking his way from Puṣkaraṇvatī to the North, who having reached a country inhabited by

¹⁾ A similar case of *dināa* found in the older recension but ousted by another word in the younger one is met with in the story of Somadeva in Pañcamaṭṭha. Instead of the *dināa* he earns in the Tantrātharika (ed. H. S. J., p 61, 12) *śukraṣaṭaṭraṇam* in the younger edition edited by B. S. J. (II, 2, 12).

Tājiks, was made a slave by them and sold to some Turuṣka or some king of Turuṣkas. Again mention is made of the Turuṣka in the relation of the *digvijaya* of Udayana by Somadeva (t 19), he defeats the cavalry of the Turuṣkas (cl 109), kills the king of the Pārasikas (cl 110) and puts to flight the Huns (cl 111) — the corresponding passage of Ksemendra (p 93 f) is so much shortened that it does not contain anything to be compared. And if we take into account also that in the first book of the Rājataranginī the kings Kamska, Huviska and Viśuṣka (Viśudeva) are named Turuṣkas, and that this testimony, be it ever so weak, must rest upon some old tradition, there seems to be nothing inconsistent in the fact that in a literary work composed on the eve of the 5th century A D the Turks are mentioned as a people established north from Jambudvīpa.

To summarize the inference to be drawn from the foregoing data and indirect indications, there can be no more question of the first or second century as the time of composition of the Pañcāī Brhatkathā, as was proposed by Bühler and Vincent A Smith, and even Levi's option in 1891 for the 3^d century would make the work somewhat older than it really is. I think Albrecht Weber's opinion uttered rather hesitatingly was nearer to the truth. Yet the work will be older than the 6th century A D. Its composition may be put about one century before, but I dare not go back beyond the year 100.

A strong objection against this conclusion would arise, if de Hertel were right asserting that the Brhatkathā, which was Sanskritized by the two Kashmirian poets was not the old and famous work of that name, but a younger compilation enlarged with interpolations of a great extent.¹⁾ In his opinion such groups of coherent tales, which by themselves represent separate books, as the Pancatantra tales and the Vetulapancaviṃśatī, did not belong to the original work. If this might prove to be true, then the prototype of the poems of Somadeva and Ksemendra would cease to be a creditable source of information and a starting-point for research with respect to the "genuine" Pañcāī Brhatkathā known to Subandhu and Bṛh. In such given case the exception of the passage in question belonging to the interpolated portions could be made, by what test should we discern the different elements of the younger compilation?

But the danger is as yet not so imminent. Hertel means we

¹⁾ In the passage of his preface quoted *supra* p. 41 below.

have to look for the old Gunadhya's own composition in the third (Sanskrit) redaction discovered by Hara Prasad of which we have spoken *supra*, p. 41. When he expressed this view he had not read even a single letter of the text he claims to stand nearest to the original Bihatkatha for at the time he published it he was not aware nor could he of M. Lacroix's article in the *Journal Asiatique*. He had no other materials at his disposal than the colophons communicated by Hara Prasad M. Lacroix who has the manuscripts at hand and is preparing an edition is more cautious and circumspect in his judgment. He presumes indeed, that tantôt qu'on pent fonder un jugement d'ensemble sur un court fragment, it has the appearance of native colour and genuineness which might induce the reader to think it nearer to the original Gunadhya than the poem of Somadeva. Yet M. Lacroix is discreet. Est-il un portrait plus fidèle de la Bihatkatha de Gunadhya que le Kathasarsigara et la Bihatkathamangur? Je m'expliquerai ultérieurement sur cette question. Mais il est dès maintenant certain qu'il devient une pièce essentielle dans le procès.

While waiting for the dissertation on this question by M. Lacroix on the ground of the new document at his disposal I think I am justified to uphold the results of my examination of it by the light of the old documents. I draw the attention to the following points.

1. Since the genuine Bihatkatha was composed in Pūjari the new redaction the *Bihatkathayam* (ôṁ ॐ / ॥ १ / ॥ १) *śloka-saṅgraha* cannot be but a modified representation of it. Is it a faithful translation or an imitation? The title it self speaks against its being a faithful translation. A *śloka-saṅgraha* does certainly not mean the original work but may denote its complete contents in a compendious form. What it exactly means will perhaps appear when the whole work as far as extant will be published.

2. As we have noticed above (*supra* p. 12) the first stanza of the *Śloka-saṅgraha* presupposes an account of the precedent events different from the other Bihatkatha. When Udayana abdicated to become an ascetic (Katha 111. 59 foll.) in both Katha and Bihika it is not Gopika but his brother Pūṣka who is installed king at Kauṣambi though the kingdom had been offered to him by Udayana, he declined it and left the sovereign power for the ascetic life in the forest. So Pūṣka has two kingdoms under his sceptre for after the death of his father Candamraka he had succeeded to him at Ujjayini (Katha 111. 61. 112. 13). But in the *Śloka-saṅgraha* Gopika reigns at Ujjayini and when being king he grows disgusted with the possession of royal power so that he

abdicates and gives over his kingdom to his brother Palaka. It is difficult to ascribe these contrarious courses of events to one and the same Brhatkatha. If they belong to different redactions, which of the two was the genuine one? It is impossible to decide this a priori. I think.

3 I doubt whether the fragment begins with the first sarga of the whole work. It is more probable I suppose that it is the beginning of a new section. It is not in the habit of the authors of Indian literary compositions, and certainly not of large poems to take up their audience or readers directly *à medias res* without any preamble, as is the fact with the first sarga, published by M. Lacôte. The whole purport of its narrative makes the strong impression that it belongs to a new section of the work, but is not the commencement of the whole. The *kathamukham* in the colophon of the third sarga may denote the outset of the narration of the life and adventures of Narayanaadatta told by him self, perhaps to Gopalaka, at a time when he was already consecrated *cakravartin* of the Vidvadhara.

4 M. Lacôte reckons the relation of the life of Gunadhya and the Lumbakas II and III of our Brhatkatha in 18 Lumbakas among the hors d'oeuvre (Journ. As. 11 p. 32). Would he think so if he were not prejudiced by the thought that the MSS of Çloka-samgraha at his disposal contain a fragment of a work which did not comprise the story of Gunadhya and the Udayanavata? The Udayanavata, from the point of view of Indian composition must be considered as essential a part of a Narayanaadattacarita, as for instance the story of Pinda in a narration of the Pindavas or the burning of Kama in the Kumara sambhava. What prevents its belonging to the much greater portion of the Çloka-samgraha which is not extant? The same applies to the Kathapithi. The original Brhatkatha, methinks must have related in its opening the marvellous process, which accounts for the promulgation among mankind of the divine tale the author of which is God Civa himself. This account is indispensable and conformable to Indian methods of introducing such large collections as the Brhatkatha.

5 Even if we take it for granted that the Çloka-samgraha represents a recension more united and less stuffed with inserted tales derived from heterogeneous sources than the Brhatkatha in eighteen Lumbakas this fact in it self does not necessarily imply its being the older recension. It is something very common in Indian literature to find side by side longer and shorter expiations of the like contents. Many legends and stories in the Mahabharata occur

more than once, sometimes told *saṃāsena*, sometimes *vistārena*. Of the *Prājñāparimitā*, the most holy book of the Mahāyānists there exist longer and shorter reductions, all of them canonical: one in 100 000, one in 25 000, one in 18 000, one in 10 000, one in 5000 lines. Is the greatest one also the youngest in time, or are the smaller ones abridgments and extracts of the large *Āstasahasra-prājñāparimitā*? BERNOUT, *Introduction* p. 164 pronounces a *non liquet*. The Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana pretends to be an extract of Bāhuvya's composition, which is in epitome of a larger work composed by Cātaketu, which itself again was the abridgment of the original Kāmasūtra in 1000 adhyāyas revealed by Śiva's bull Nandin! For this reason, even if the existence of two Pañcaviṃśatī-Bhātakathās were to be proved satisfactorily, one larger and one smaller, this fact would not prejudicate the answer to be given at the question about the time relation between them.

6 The story of the Bhātakathā, to which Subandhu (p. 110 of Hall's ed.) alludes, is a tale inserted into the story of Viśvamañña which makes up lambaka XVIII of Kathās. This king and his adventures have nothing at all to do with Naravāhanadatta: safe that N listens to the narration by Kanva. This story if any would be one of the 'hors d'oeuvre' interpolated into the genuine Brhatkathā if interpolation had happened! It was nevertheless known to Subandhu in the sixth century A.D. and known as occurring in Guṇādhyā's Bhātakathā.

7 The same passage of Subandhu teaches us also something more. The Bhātakathā, to which he refers, was divided into *lambakas* or *lambhas*. The same division must needs have been that of the Pañcaviṃśatī prototype worked upon by the two Kashmiri poets. In the MSS of Bṛhatkathā the books are called *lambaka* or *lambhaka* (see the article of Bühler in the *Ind. Antiqu.* of 1871 and the colophon of book I, p. 33 of the edit.). In Kathās both editors everywhere agree in naming them *lambaka*. Cp. *supra*, p. 11, n. 1. But the new fragment is not divided into lambh(ka)s, but into smṛgīs.

As to the person of Guṇādhyā, the reputed author of the Bhātakathā, the opinions vary. According to some he is a historical person, according to others, his name is likely to be as fictitious as that of the Vedavyāsa. It is impossible to settle the question. The Brhatkathā has this in common with so many old works ascribed to individual authors that the name of the reputed author occurs in the work itself. How can Śītavahana be the real author of Kathāpūṭha, where his own wondrous history is narrated and he

is spoken of in the third person? Let us rather avow that we do not know anything about the reputed authors of the Great Storehouse of Tales and that is something like to nothing to combine their authorship with the names — mere names, indeed — of Guṇīdhya and Satavahna, the intrinsic value of which is = x. The only conclusion permitted to us, and thus at least is more than nothing, is this, that a celebrated work, the author or authors of which are half mythical persons, must be ancient. For the rest, in questions like these account must be kept with analogous imputation of the authorship of celebrated and authoritative works on mythical personages. I refer to the statement of JORIN in the *Journal of the Roy Asiatic Society* 1907, p. 174, about medical tradition, where he says „Since it was a generally prevailing practice with writers of medical textbooks to give out their compositions as an abridgment of some early work written by a divinely inspired sage ”

SECTION II

THE TEXT OF THE KATHASARITSĀGARA

CHAPTER I

THE TWO EDITIONS

§ 1

As has been stated above (*supra*, p. 7), the Kathāsaritsāgara has been edited twice, by Brockhaus and by Durgaprasāda (and his son Kāśhinātha Pindurang Parib). The former's edition is based on six MSS for his first volume and on an equal number for his second and third volumes. Yet these are not quite the same. Four of those which served him for his publication of lumb I—V were left aside, when he was preparing the edition of the rest: as necessarily results from a comparison of the two prefaces of 1839 and 1864. It is plain that he could no longer avail himself of M = m 3959 of the *Catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the library of the India Office* for it stops after lumb V, but it is not clear what prevented him from making use, as he did before, of A = nr 3948—50, B = either m 3951—53 or 3956—58, C = m 3954 and 55. Of the other two, one was employed accordingly for the whole work. D, a copy taken from a Calcutta MS, the original of which belongs to the Sanskrit college: this copy is now in the Royal Library at Berlin¹⁾ as to the other W a copy from a Benares MS, forwarded to him by Wilson. Brockhaus says „aus ihm habe ich cap. 27—61 copirt“, it is now at Oxford in the Bodleian. The four new manuscripts acquired for the constitution of the text of lumb VI—XVIII, H, G, S, and R are now at Berlin in the Royal Library (see Weber's *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit und Prākṛit Handschriften* [der Königl. Bibl. zu Berlin] II, nr 1574—1578). Of them S (nr 1577) is a copy from a

¹⁾ Brockhaus presented it to the Royal Library of Dresden but afterwards it passed over to Berlin, see Weber's *Verzeichniss* II, nr 1569—1573 with the foot-note 3 on p. 158.

Sigor MS which he had obtained from Iitz Edward Hall, its original, a Kashmir MS, the oldest *pustaka* of his whole apparatus „gehorte wohl in den Anfang des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts” (Weber)

The two pundits who brought about the Bombay edition, printed at the Nirṇaya-sāgara Press, had besides the edition of Brockhaus two more MSS at their disposition. The former of which they describe thus (p. 2 of their Preface) *lata Kacmuralikhatam ekam nalinam pūyaka śuddham asmādiyam pustakam*. The other MS did not belong to them, but to the Townhall Royal Library at Bombay, being formerly Dr. Bhau Dājī's, it has been written samvat 1743 = 1686 A.D. at Benares and is not so good as the former one — *nāticundham* — though very neatly kept, *manoharasavarupam*. I suppose that it is from the Kashmir MS the editors took a good deal of the excellent corrections by which their publication surpasses the edition of Brockhaus.

Neither edition has the right to be called a critical one. The text is critically edited, but there is no reference whatever made to the various readings of the MSS. Brockhaus, in the Preface on his first volume (p. IV), declares that he did his utmost to make the best of the discrepancies of his MSS. „Nicht überall ist mir dies gelungen, viele Stellen sind nur undeutlich oder ganz unerklärlich geblieben, doch habe ich es als strengen Grundsatz durchgeführt keine Conjecturen in den Text aufzunehmen, sondern nur durch Handschriften autorisirte Lesarten”. In 1839 though he realized, it seems, that a scholarly edition could not do without a mention, however succinct, of the most important various readings especially in such places as remained „undeutlich oder ganz unerklärlich”, yet the addition of them, he says, would have augmented the cost so exceedingly that he was obliged to omit *diese Zusätze* *für so wichtig und notwendig ich sie auch halte*. A similar complaint is made in the Preface on p. IV of the last volume (1866) „Die Varianten aus den Handschriften mitzutheilen, war unmöglich, ich hätte dazu den doppelten Raum, den der Text einnimmt, gebraucht

It is a matter of course that the Nirṇaya-sāgara Press edition is likewise devoid of even the shortest *apparatus criticus*. Something like this is not in the habit of Hindoo scholars.

If once, in time hereafter, the critical edition suitable for a work of that importance will be called for, many more MSS must be consulted. Aufrecht, in his *Catalogus Catalogorum*, registers them at p. 78 of his Ist vol., to which he adds others in his Part II and III. I cannot but that Brockhaus availed himself of MS 1574 in Weber's Catalogue.

Tawney, in the notes on his translation, sometimes makes mention of better readings than the text of Brockhaus offered him, which he borrowed from MSS of the Calcutta College. The first time he cites one is Vol I, p. 118, with respect to tr 19, 64, where Br¹⁾ reads *dattasampadaka* and D¹⁾ has put into the text *°sammadaka*, his MS has *°sambhara*. At p. 155 Tawney doubtless refers to the same MS lent to me by the librarian of the Sanskrit College, cp his note on p. 203, where he calls it 'an excellent MS'. Afterwards he had the opportunity of using also three India Office MSS lent to him by Dr. Rost, which I suppose to be those denoted by Brockhaus as A, B and C, readings from them are mentioned in the foot notes from tr 102 till the end of the work, see note on II, 388 etc.

Upon the whole the MSS contain nearly the same text. There are instances of *glokas* found in one MS and wanting in another, but they are few, very few. Tr 23, 4—7 in Br's ed have one line less and one more, than they have in D. D's 23, 4 a b is wanting in Br, and Br's 23, 7 c d is wanting in D. — Between Br 24 116 and 117 D interposes one *gloka*: this *gloka* (D 21, 117) added improves the narrative style. — Likewise at t 26, 134, D has two *glokas* more and in a place where they are indispensable. This is even transparent in T's¹⁾ translation (I, 226). There upon the Brahmin set out with the merchant's agents to go to that island of Utsthala and by chance the sons of the king of fishermen saw him there." It is told here that Çaktideva set out to Utsthala but it is not told that he arrived but his departure is closely connected with his meeting in that island with the sons of Sityavata. In D the passage runs thus:— I have bracketed that which is wanting in Br

*ity uktaḥ tena raṁṇe sa tair tadvyavaharibhiḥ
 sukam tad Utsthaladīpam (Çaktidevo yayan tataḥ ||
 yaḥ sa bandhū mahatma me Visnudatto tra tisthate
 pragat tasyaiva nikatam vasteri icchamī tanmatham ||
 itī samprapya ca dīpam tatkulam ca vrentya sah
 ūpanmadhyamargena) gantum pravarata dīpam ||*

In 'T' after 'Utsthala' there must, therefore be inserted this, with the intention to stay there with his relative (his uncle) Visnudatta, the reverend inmate of the monastery of that island,

¹⁾ From henceforward the sign Br denotes Brockhaus and his edition D that of Durvasara. T Tawney's translation t = taran a.

as before So Çaktideva reached the island and forthwith began to take his way through the bazar Then by chance etc

D in a note on p 311 of his second edition notifies that the line, corresponding to t 60 93 of Blochhaus, is wanting in one of his MSS Considering it an interpolation he has not put it into the text I think he is right doing so In this way the necessity of supposing a hiatus of the former part of cl 96 disappears Br 95 c d and 96 c d belong together nothing is wanting between those lines as Bironconsciously believed in D they are connected, and I II 32 connected them likewise

In the vetak nr 7 t 81 15 D in a note gives $1\frac{1}{2}$ additional çloka which he has not put into the text Those lines are found in one MS and are not mentioned by B

One çloka t 103 159 of D is wanting in B Its addition greatly improves the style The abrupt transition from the turgid description of the ocean like host of Migmadatta and his father in law mçl 157 and 158 to the very plain matter of fact content of Br 159 disappears in this way D has put this çloka into the text it fills up a gap indeed — Likewise D has two lines more than are found in B inserted in t 108 viz between Br çl 151 a b and c d this additional çloka depicts the beauty and loveliness of the maiden Vivavegavara They are quite appropriate to the situation and I hold them for genuine

After t 123 260 there is a gap of sundry çlokas which Br did not realize It is disclosed by D's text We detect the gap by putting together the parallel places in Katha and Bihkm Kusumavudha pupil of a learned brahmana had fallen in love with the daughter of this teacher She answered his love but having been promised to another suitor told him to come her to be carried off A servant of his whom he had ordered to take her with a male treacherously desiring to keep her for himself conducted her to some distant place not to his master, then he told her he was going to marry her himself On beholding herself in his power the girl cunningly feigns to a queen to that sudden change of husband but she says you must marry me duly and in good order go and fetch the requisite for the nuptial ceremony Meanwhile he set out to the next town to buy the necessary things she fled with the maid to the dwelling of a girl and maker who concealed her In Br's Katha the feigned ascent of the maiden is only indicated by the half çloka *et least it is beautiful for it has a fine sūlara (grigal) çl 260 c d* the next line relates in going to the town to make purchase D inserts here between both one

çloka, the former part of which is *tiṃ evaṃ na kiṃ sadyaḥ
partineyo sy aho mama* the latter part is lost. It is, however,
obvious that there is lost more. Cf. this parallel in Bihkm (p. 401,
çl. 35 foll.)

**pracchudya vāha ko doṣas tiṃ mamabhyadhikāḥ priyāḥ ||
kiṃ lucilavibhāṇa tiyodāham aṃaḥ bāje*

ānayoṣaśasunagrīm tiṃ vīriṅguliyālam ¹⁾ || (36)

iti çūṭha gale tasmims tatal kamalalocanā

inera trasat śadhyā malakamāmeranam || (37)

If we consider that Ksemendī has much shortened here we must conclude to the loss of $1\frac{1}{2}$ or $2\frac{1}{2}$ çlokas at least which contained her conditions and the suggestion to buy the marriage implements.

The line t. 124, 111 cd B₁ is not found in D. It is in fact a dittography of çl. 109 cd. çl. 112 B₁ is in D the second part of 111 and B₁ s erroneous signs of quotation must disappear.

For the rest the differences of reading are not great and move between limits sufficiently narrow as to make it plain that there can hardly be question of more than one redaction. Instances of variances bearing to whole çlokas are none except t. 88 36 where the same fact is said with quite different words in B₁ and in D. Other instances of minor importance are 15 189 44 66 59 82 (D's reading is here much better) 94 51 (here the Calcutta MS considerably differs from both B₁ and D) and 116 49. The last passage deserves a more accurate exposition.

Padmīvatī learns from her attendance that the young man in her presence who has rescued her from the two princesses is the very prince destined by her father to be her husband. She is extremely rejoiced by that news and likewise the young man is delighted. The çloka descriptive of their mutual feeling is in B₁ as follows

tato nyonya parijñāna lāsa pūrṇe nyatmani

, yuktaṃ yad adya ita ayatā¹ iti kamariṇau ubhau ||

in ¹⁾ translation (II, 525) Then the princess and her lover had their hearts filled with joy at discovering one another, and they both thought, „it is well that we came here to-day. Here the absence

¹⁾ The aksara lost and marked as such in the printed text may be γ . I conjecture γ $\text{kr} < \gamma > \eta$ $\text{lip} \text{ lan}$

of the word meaning *thought* in the original is somewhat strange, though not impossible. But D has a quite different reading, doubtless the right one

yūttam tad yān na matah sma tau kumarānāv ubhau
it was a matter of course that they could not contain themselves (for joy). Cp 22, 131 *na mati sma muda kīracit*. The comparative keenness of the idiom *na mati* with that meaning may be a factor in the origin of the various reading.

Another instance of a genuine reading ousted by its difficulty is t 18, 189. The gallant Viduraśakī, having rescued the princess and placed her into her private apartments, is taking his leave, but she does not allow it. 'stay with me' she says, 'when you are gone this breath of mine will leave my body overcome with fear'. Whereupon he resolves to remain, reflecting thus [T I, 134]. 'If I go, and leave this maiden she may possibly die of fear'. The original line in question translated thus by T from Br's text is *tyaktvemaṃ yadi gacchami muncet prāṇaṃ bhayaḍ iyaṃ*. D has a lectio difficilior, viz *yad astu me na gacchami* etc. = 'happen what may I remain she might possibly die of fear'. The idiom *yad astu* = 'come what will' fr. *adieu* *que pourra* has given way in most MSS. it seems to a somewhat synonymous turn of phrase more common but less forcible. In the other instances, where it occurs it has however kept its place 27, 86 54, 123 71 133 153 73 156 81, 21 101, 304 113 40 *īdā bhavati* with the same meaning is met with 33, 45 and 77 161 likewise *yad vidhattu vidhū mama* 57, 99 and *yattu caṣṭu* 101 135. I have enumerated these instances, because they represent also a syntactical peculiarity not registered elsewhere. It is of course an elliptical turn *yad astu (bhavati)* is a brachy 'logarithmic' form of *yad astu astu yad bhavatu bhavatu*. A slight variation of it is exhibited 119 86 B₁ *yad bhavati* = 'quod futurum est sc. fut' but D instead of *yad bhavati* has *yad bhavati* evidently a false reading.

A few times the variants concern some rare or provincial word for which in part of the mss a more common word has been substituted. As *mecaka* 124 197 D (*gyamala* B₁) *śevakī* 121 237 D, cp 1 II 54 n 1 (*Jajantah* B₁) likewise 1, 25 D

priyapranajakīśakī yato mumaratumanat

B₁ has *priyapranayaletarīṣam*, the vitiated reading.

Finally I remind of the various reading in the first stanza of the *praeastū* at the end of the work and edited in D. Br did not

take it up in his edition I cannot understand for what reason for he found it in his MSS WRBR in his Catalogue of MSS vol II (1886) p 161 repaired the omission of the editor of Kathis publishing the *prāṣasti* in extenso with the discrepancies of the Berlin MSS. So we know that King Singumiraja of Kashmir the forefather of King Harsa in whose reign Somadeva composed his poem is connected in some MSS with Sitavahana in others it seems not so. The MSS (marked by Br) H and S begin the *prāṣasti* thus *cuṣitavāṇakulābhidhīṃ vyūṭaḥ Sangramaraja it*, and this is also the reading adopted by D. But in the MS W the first pāda is *saṅgramalābhallacānubhājavacchitānāḥ* what is materially different. It looks as if the reputed descent from the legendary king, Sita (or Sita) vahana was disbelieved by some who changed the words of Somadeva accordingly.

§ 2

While perusing Br I was stricken by the comparatively great number of verses in that edition that sin against the laws of the metre. *All of them without exception are edited in D without fault*. In 191 cases his verses are too short in 60 they are too long. Here is the list of them.

too short	2	39	—	3	35	45	—	7	111	(vāsantatilaka)	—		
	10	15	—	12	21	151	—	13	112	—	14	11	
	71	—	18	200	320	323	—	20	173	183	221	—	
	22	195	—	21	13	64	—	25	60	112	110	—	
	26	201	229	—	27	71	—	28	11	—	30	121	
	31	62	—	33	26	—	36	1	—	37	331	—	
	10	29	175	—	40	25	—	42	90	191	—	43	
	133	—	44	165	—	45	115	—	46	16	14	112	
	117	—	47	51	118	—	48	54	63	—	49	35	
	231	[= 229 D]	—	50	35 1)	130 1)	172 1)	206 1)	[vāsantatilaka]	—	51	60	
	—	53	93	—	54	41	53	61	105	210	—	55	222
	—	56	31	184	313 1)	335 1)	338 1)	349 1)	—	57	70	—	
	135	151	—	58	133	—	59	61	113	129	—	60	—
	74	217 1)	232 1)	241 1)	—	61	256	—	62	128	—	—	—
	216	—	63	22	59	111	—	65	101	225	241	—	—
	66	21	13	51	—	69	27	60	116	132	170	—	—

) In D the number of the śloka must be indicated with the

70 36 16 — 71 19 101 158 218 287 — 72,
 65 75 173 301 350 392 — 73, 8 178 291
 403 438 — 74 222 227 — 75, 123 — 77, 32
 56 — 80, 6 (see I's note at II, 261) 10 — 81,
 21 48 — 82, 15 — 86, 57 85 122 128 — 90,
 13 — 92, 2 22 38 — 93, 94 — 94, 132 —
 95, 16 51 52 66 91 — 97, 27 — 101, 32 —
 102, 18 — 103, 172 — 104, 111 [= 110 D] —
 105, 29 47 53 63 — 106 48 — 107 25 118
 123 — 108 180 [= 181 D] 109, 49 60 94 142 —
 110 22 ¹⁾ 63 89 123 — 111, 60, — 112, 165 —
 113, 18 82 — 114, 67 83 104 — 115, 3 82
 146 — 117, 166 — 118, 26 179 — 119, 5 67
 108 115 — 121 24 41 118 — 123, 67 200
 221 247 322 — 124 103 214 [= 213 D]

too long 1 36 57 — 6, 56 ²⁾ — 10, 92 — 11 64 — 17,
 80 — 18, 153 316 — 21, 112 116 — 25, 160 —
 26 12 — 30, 48 — 34, 95 — 38, 27 — 39,
 105 236 — 40 22 — 43 252 (गुणः) 256 (चंद्रिका)
 274 (नृपति) — 44 73 — 45, 142 — 49, 4 21 —
 50, 88 [= 87 D] — 52 111 331 — 53 55 ²⁾ 232 —
 60 32 — 64, 132 — 65 157 167 251 — 66
 35 — 71, 221 — 72 305 336 — 74, 153 —
 77 53 — 86 143 — 92, 57 81 — 96, 34 —
 98, 14 — 101, 127 208 — 104, 153 [= 152 D] —
 110 73 — 111 99 — 115 26 — 116 55 —
 117 40 93 — 118 108 123 — 119, 28 — 120,
 66 — 123 110

The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts. In some cases even trisyllable words are dropped as 49, 231 73 138 80 6 108, 180 114 83 123, 200. Elsewhere, as may occur in mss. by oversight of the scribes, he leaves out one of two words similar to one another e.g. 52, 314 *pūspit* before *pūspam* 39 10 *lāta* after *ekatra*. A remarkable case of *pramada* is 59, 129a. Br reads that line

dr̥ṣṭuṃ Somaṣṭrabhāṣaṃ 'kṛtā 'yam' ity ajrecl̥yata

¹⁾ In D 2011 *pit* is an error of print for *pit* *et* *ja*.

²⁾ Br has *et* *et* *et* for *et* *et* *et*, and *pit* *et* *et* instead of *pit* *et* *et*.

From D it appears that the genuine text is

distva Somaprabham lo 'yam ite svarnam aprachyata

Consequently Br not only dropped the word *svanam* but applied the sandhi to *ite + aprachyata* without becoming aware that he destroyed the metre — At 25 60 Satyavata being asked, whether he knew Goldcity, answers

*Im tu distva bahudvipa dīśanapī na su mayā
nagari tadabhipreṭa dīpīntesu śrūta kunah ||*

though I have visited many islands I never saw the city which you are longing for, yet I have heard of it while staying in the farthest islands. This is the right text of D. Br whether owing to bad readings of his mss. or a mistake of his own represents it as follows *Im tu distā bahudvipa diste adya* [his peculiar analysis of *distadya*] *na su mayā* etc., spoiling not only the verse of one syllable but eclipsing at the same time an interesting instance of a compound with *diśan* according to Pāṇini 3 2 94 — In the same t. 25 at 112 Br edits with the omission of one syllable *abhradyudupitadavaniam*, where he had to put *anabhrāṇ*, as of course D has by this oversight he impairs the poetical expression for Somadeva does not say as P translates according to Br's text an attack of the fire of grief terrible like the falling of lightning from a cloud but — from a cloudless sky a frequent image in poetry.

In 69 138 where Br edited the last pāda *paṇḍaris t m etā anumānah* his mistake and in consequence of it his disturbing both the rule of sandhi and the metre was caused by a misunderstanding for *anumanal* D has *tanmanah* and now all is right. Another instance of the same fault, but in inverse sense is 21 54 *śaḍagbasyata* (D) Br *śaḍ agl*°.

The misreading coincides here with vitiation of the metre. Apart from the metre Brockhaus must have made such mistakes many times, part of the better readings of D do not correct faults of the manuscripts but of the editor. It is of course not possible nor of great utility to try to draw the boundary between the two sources of errors. It may, however, be useful to mention in general the causes of confusion and consequently of deprivation in Br's text.

dy and *gh* are confounded 57, 1 see Wimmer *Verzeichniss* etc. (1886) p. 159 n. 2.

s and *m* (c. g. 102, 113 *sa samanayat* for *samamunayat*)

sv and *lh* 106, 110 (*lheda* for *sveda*)

t and *dh* 12, 19 (*dhrtavan* for *rtavan*) 26, 17 (*dhurayami* for *urayami*) 19, 2 (*dhua* for *ura*)

70, 36 46. — 71, 19 101 158 218 287 — 72,
 65 75, 173. 301. 350. 392 — 73, 8 178. 291
 403 438 — 74, 222. 227. — 75, 123. — 77, 32.
 56 — 80, 6 (see Tr's note at II, 261) 10 — 81,
 21 48 — 82, 15. — 86, 57. 85. 122 128 — 90,
 13 — 92, 2. 22. 38 — 93, 94 — 94, 132 —
 95, 16. 51. 52 66. 91. — 97, 27 — 101, 32. —
 102, 18 — 103, 172. — 104, 111 [= 110 D] —
 105, 29. 47 53 63 — 106, 48 — 107, 25 118.
 123 — 108, 180 [= 181 D] 109, 49. 60 94. 142. —
 110, 22 ¹⁾ 63 89. 123 — 111, 60, — 112, 165 —
 113, 48 82 — 114, 67. 83 104 — 115, 3 82
 146 — 117, 166 ¹⁾ — 118, 20 179 — 119, 5 67.
 108 115 — 121, 24 44 118 — 123, 67. 200.
 221 247 322 — 124, 105 214 [= 213 D]
 too long 1, 36 57 — 6, 56 ²⁾ — 10, 92 — 11, 64 — 17,
 80 — 18, 153 316 — 21, 112. 116 — 25, 160. —
 26, 12 — 30, 48 — 34, 95 — 38, 27 — 39,
 105 236 — 40, 22 — 43, 252 (ñayā) 256 (cārdūlav.)
 274 (upagita) — 44, 73 — 45, 142 — 49, 4 21 —
 50, 88 [= 87 D] — 52, 111 331 — 55, 55 ²⁾ 232. —
 60, 32 — 64, 132 — 65, 157 167 251 — 66,
 35 — 71, 221 — 72, 305 356 — 74, 153 —
 77, 53 — 86, 143 — 92, 57 81 — 96, 34 —
 98, 14 — 101, 127 208 — 104, 153 [= 152 D] —
 110, 73 — 111, 99 — 115, 26 — 116, 55 —
 117, 10 95 — 118, 108 123 — 119, 28 — 120,
 66 — 123, 110

The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses, which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts. In some cases even trisyllable words are dropped, as 49, 231 73, 138 80, 6 108, 180 114, 83 123, 200. Elsewhere, as may occur in mss. by oversight of the scribes, he leaves out one of two words similar to one another, e.g. 52, 314 *pūṣpat* before *pūṣpam*, 39, 10 *tatīa* after *ekatīa*. A remarkable case of *pramāda* is 59, 129 a. B₁ reads that line

distā Somaprabham, „ko 'yam?' ity apicchyata

¹⁾ In D *manṣṭhya* is an error of print for *manṣṭya*

²⁾ Tr has *surānam* for *starnam*, and *prithvyāni* instead of *prithvām*

From D it appears that the genuine text is

distva Somapiabham lo 'yam iti svairam apicchyata

Consequently B₁ not only dropped the word *svairam* but applied the sandhi to *iti* + *apicchyata* without becoming aware that he destroyed the metre — At 25, 60 Sityvanta being asked, whether he knew Goldcity, answers

*kim tu distva bahudvipaḥ śrī anapī na sa mayā
nagaraḥ tadabhipreṭa dīpintese śrīta pūṇah ||*

though I have visited many islands I never saw the city which you are longing for yet I have heard of it while staying in the farthest islands' This is the right text of D B₁ whether owing to bad readings of his ms or a mistake of his own represents it as follows *kim tu distva bahudvipaḥ drṣṭa 'adya* [his peculiar analysis of *drṣṭadya*] *na sa mayā* etc., spoiling not only the verse of one syllable, but eclipsing at the same time an interesting instance of a compound with *°dīpīan* according to Panini 3, 2, 91 — In the same t 25 at 51 112 B₁ edits with the omission of one syllable *abhravidyudupstadarunam* where he had to put *anabhrā°*, is of course D hrs, by this oversight he impairs the poetical expression, for Somadeva does not say as P translates according to B₁'s text in attack of the foe of great terrible like the falling of lightning from a cloud but — from a cloudless sky — a frequent image in poetry

In 69 138 where B₁ edited the last padī *paṇḍas tē eva nūmanā* his mistake and in consequence of it his disturbing both the rule of sandhi and the metre was caused by a misreading for *nūmanā* D hrs *tanmanā* and now all is right Another instance of the same fault, but in inverse sense is 21 54 *śaḍagbhospato* (D), B₁ *śaḍ agb°*

The misreading coincides here with violation of the metre Apart from the metre Brockhaus must have made such mistakes many times part of the better readings of D do not correct faults of the manuscripts but of the editor It is of course not possible nor of great utility to try to draw the boundary between the two sources of errors It may however, be useful to mention in general the causes of confusion and consequently of depravation in B₁'s text

dy and *gh* are confounded 57, 1 see WILKE *Indischness* etc (1886) p 159 n 2

s and *m* (e g 102, 113 *sa samanayal* for *samamunayal*)

śi and *kh* 106, 110 (*kheda* for *śveda*)

v and *dh* 12, 19 (*dhīṭavan* for *śīṭavan*) 26, 17 (*dhurayam* for *śarayam*), 19, 2 (*dhīra* for *śīra*)

70, 36 46 — 71, 19 101 158 218 287 — 72,
 65 75 173 301 350 392 — 73, 8 178 291
 403 438 — 74, 222 227 — 75, 123 — 77, 32
 56 — 80, 6 (see T's note at II, 261) 10 — 81,
 21 48 — 82, 15 — 86, 57 85 122 128 — 90,
 13 — 92, 2 22 38 — 93, 94 — 94, 132 —
 95, 16 51 52 66 91 — 97, 27 — 101, 32. —
 102, 48 — 103, 172 — 104, 111 [= 110 D] —
 105, 29 47 53 63 — 106, 48 — 107, 25 118
 123 — 108, 180 [= 181 D] 109, 49 60 94 142 —
 110, 22 ¹⁾ 63 89 123 — 111, 60, — 112, 165 —
 113, 48 82 — 114, 67 83 104 — 115, 3 82
 146 — 117, 166 — 118, 26 179 — 119, 5 67
 108 115 — 121, 24 44 118 — 123, 67 200
 221 247 322 — 124, 105 214 [= 213 D]
 too long 1, 36 57 — 6, 56 ²⁾ — 10, 92 — 11, 64 — 17,
 80 — 18, 153 316 — 21, 112 116 — 25, 160 —
 26, 12 — 30, 48 — 34, 95 — 38, 27 — 39,
 105 236 — 40, 22 — 43, 252 (ārāṭ) 256 (ṣardulav)
 271 (upagati) — 44, 73 — 45, 142 — 49, 4 21 —
 50, 88 [= 87 D] — 52, 111 331 — 55, 55 ³⁾ 232 —
 60, 32 — 64, 132 — 65, 157 167 254 — 66,
 35 — 71, 221 — 72, 305 356 — 74, 153 —
 77, 53 — 86 143 — 92, 57 81 — 96, 34 —
 98, 44 — 101, 127 208 — 104, 153 [= 152 D] —
 110, 73 — 114, 99 — 115, 26 — 116, 55 —
 117, 40 95 — 118 108 123 — 119, 28 — 120,
 66 — 123, 110

The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses, which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts. In some cases even trisyllable words are dropped, as 19, 231 73, 138 80, 6 108, 180 114 83 123, 200. Elsewhere, as may occur in me by oversight of the scribes, he leaves out one of two words similar to one another, e.g. 52, 311 *paṇḍit* before *paṇḍit*, 39, 10 *lutra* after *ekutra*. A remarkable case of *pranāda* is 59, 129 a. Br reads that line

deṣṭeṭ Souaprabhāṭi „ko 'yaṇi?' ity aprecchata

¹⁾ In D n *evetṭa* is an error of print for *n evetṭa*.

²⁾ It has *sa u* instead for *saṇḍa*, and *peṭhaya* instead of *peṭṭiya*.

From D it appears that the genuine text is

distva Somaprabham lo 'yam iti svairam apicchyata

Consequently Br not only dropped the word *svairam* but applied the sandhi to *iti* + *apicchyata* without becoming aware that he destroyed the metre — At 25 60 Śrīyāmi ita being asked, whether he knew Goldcity, answers

*Im tu distva bahudvipaḥ śrīyāmi na sa mayu
nagari tadabhipreṭa dīpantera śrūta pūnah ||*

though I have visited many islands I never saw the city which you are longing for, yet I have heard of it while staying in the farthest islands. This is the right text of D. Br whether owing to bad readings of his mss or a mistake of his own represents it as follows: *Im tu distva bahudvipa distva 'adja* [his peculiar analysis of *distadya*] *na sa mayu* etc., spoiling not only the verse of one syllable, but eclipsing at the same time an interesting instance of a compound with °*dīpan* according to Pāṇini 3 2 91 — In the same text 25 it cl 112 Br edits with the omission of one syllable *abhinadyudapataḥ* where he had to put *anabhinā*°, as of course D has, by this oversight he impairs the poetical expression for Somadeva does not see as I translate according to Br's text an attack of the fire of great terrible like the falling of lightning from a cloud but — from a cloudless sky' a frequent image in poetry.

In 69 138 where Br edited the list *pāṇya* is *tan eva manana* his mistake and in consequence of it his disturbing both the rule of sandhi and the metre, was caused by a misreading for *manana* of D has *tanmanah* and now all is right. Another instance of the same fault, but in inverse sense is 21 34 *adagbhogata* (D) Br *ad agl*°.

The misreading concludes here with violation of the metre. Apart from the metre Brockhaus must have made such mistakes many times, part of the better readings of D do not correct faults of the manuscripts but of the editor. It is of course not possible nor of great utility to try to draw the boundary between the two sources of errors. It may, however, be useful to mention in general the causes of confusion and consequently of deprivation in Br's text.

dy and *gh* are confounded 57, 1 see Weber *Lezen/mss* etc (1886) p. 159 n. 2

s and *m* (c. g. 102, 113 *sa samanaya* for *sarīam mayat*)

sv and *kh* 106, 110 (*kheda* for *veda*)

i and *dh* 12, 19 (*dhītan* for *vītan*), 26, 17 (*dhārayam* for *carayam*), 19, 2 (*dhīra* for *vīra*)

i and *u* 45, 232 (*pravitam* is to be corrected into *pravrttam*
D Prahlāda beheld „her dancing” not her „who came forward
to dance”, as T I, 425 translated, misled by Br) So 15,
52 (*nyojatah* for *u*°), 59, 16 (*vyadhāt* for *nyadhāt*), 23, 40
(Br *vidhūm avapasyasi*, it ought to be *vidhūm*, cp 45 *vidhūnam*),
74, 221 (*maritā*° for *maritā*°, the same blunder 104, 32
113, 65 123, 58)

n and *t* 119, 200 (Br *na payanti* instead of *tapasyanti* D and T)
56, 111 (*anāyantā* for *anāyattu*, as Kern corrected already
in 1868). Sometimes the particle of interrogation *nu* has
become to *tu*, as 51, 258 (D has here also the corrupt
reading) 71, 57 78, 107.

nn and *ti* Bṛ put *tatra* for *tan na* 46, 178 101, 230 106,
157, and inversely 106, 90 Cp. also 105, 73 A somewhat
comic result of that interchange is met with 65, 46, where
Br makes a Bodhisattva gratify living beings and Piṣācas by
„presents of water and jewels” (T II 104), while the poet
meant *jalan annaḥ* (with water and food) not *jalan ratnaḥ*,
as we read in Br The same mistake impurs 66, 154 Instead
of *dhanai ratnaḥ ca* (Br) D has *dhanair annaḥ ca*, the
evident meaning of the passage is clear from cl 153 *presayan
asa pakṣiannāni dhanani ca* An instance of putting *tra*
into the text instead of *ni* occurs 57, 106

t and *bh* *abhi* for *ati* 38 115 inversely *t* 99, 50 Bṛ has
wrongly *atyatusyat* for *abhyatusyat* (D) At 77, 13 Br mis-read
sabhyam ‘judge, umpire, and put *satyam* into his text, D
rendered to the verse its true wording *nīcayayatha sabhyam
tam rajaputram upayathuh* The inverse error, *sabhya* for *satya*,
occurs 56, 217 The plain and appropriate expression of this śloka
*tac chrutvā dūyakaṁsam sa matā satyabhibhāsinam
mumoca Damayanti tam evam asti iti vadini* ||

as it is edited in D¹⁾, is miserably perplexed in Br, where
the word *sabhyabhibhāsinam* deceived Tawney who (I, 560)
translates „she thought that the celestial swan was a polished
speaker” instead of — spoke the truth Here Boettlingk
detected the mistake of Br, see Petr Diet VII, 674 s v
sabhya in fine

r and *ri* 10, 107 (*traya* for *tritaya*) 26, 269 Br = 271 D
(*trsa* for *trsa*) Likewise *r* for *ra* 105, 157, see F II, 459 n 3
Other samples may be 58, 139 *tatah sa samprāpya junaḥ*

¹⁾ Where it is gl 216

svarajyam (B) spoils this line editing *latal samam prapya* etc.) 68 11 *udghātāt*, misread by B as *īdātāt*, see P.W.K. II 234 s. v. *udātā* 88 52 *śubhād apī karṣṇamāl* (D) while B has *śaṣṭhād* 103 5 while B against the obvious sense put *śaṣṭeṣu* instead of *śaṣṭeṣu* the wrong reading *uṣma* for *īṣṇa* at 87 30 and 121 136 B [= 135 D] cp. I's note on II, 619 the confounding of anusvara with *r* and *l* at 19 73 and 25 204 — in the former place D has *malīmardabhojō*, in the latter *te* (B *lam*) — 7 84 *sarvūpatya* B seems to represent a misread *sarvūṣṇya* (D) 13, 13 *saptaka* (B) a misread *mastaka* (D) and 73 7 *Victrāḥallam attā tāt* (B) a misread *Victrāḥallasaṁyāham* (D)

Mistakes such as putting *ea* for *æa* (13 117 20 102 55 131 120 62) or inversely (111 76) *ei* for *eha* (123, 171) *ela* for *ela* (20 197) *hita* for *lata* (20 226 75 95) or inversely (81 8) *apel* for *upel* (17 12) or inversely (70 17) *apakṛya* for *īpakṛya* (93 68) *ayam* for *alam* (21 20 21 169) *vismṛta* for *vismṛti* (31 216) *gana* for *guṇa* or inversely (e g 15, 368) and the like may be caused partly by mere fact reading of the MSS partly also by not correcting ordinary clerical errors wherever common sense convinces them. The ingenious avowal of B in the Preface of the first Volume (p. IX) that he nowhere has put into the text any conjecture not backed by mss. authority practically resulted towards preferring occasional abdication of his intellectual faculties to disregarding a palpable corrupt tradition in the mss. which he happened to have the use of.

The confusion between *b* and *v* and between the different sibilants in his MSS made him now and then take a wrong way. Of the former kind t 123 175 and 191 *śmāḥ* and instances in both places B writes *janyatalakam* which should be written *janyabalakam* as is edited indeed in D = the company of the bridegroom's friends (I II 602). As to the sibilants B sometimes puts *disa* for *daśa* fisherman (e g 52 337) *reṣa* for *reṣa*. A remarkable mistake is t 20 122 *aṣu ea* (B) for *asta ea* (D) which could be easily made since *sta* and *su* can be very similar in manuscripts another t 101 13 *bisam* spelt *viṣam*.

Another source of errors was effected by his singular method of separating the words and word-complexes something very proper to produce errors of any kind. In the 2^d and 3^d volumes the

v and *n* 45, 232 (*pravittam* is to be corrected into *pramittam* D Prahlāda beheld „her dancing” not her „who came forward to dance”, as T I, 425 translated, misled by Br) So 15, 82 (*nyojitah* for *u*°), 59, 46 (*nyadhāt* for *nyadhāt*), 23, 40 (Bī *vidhīm atapsyasi*, it ought to be *vidhīm*, cp 45 *vidhānam*), 71, 221 (*unāritā*° for *unāritā*°, the same blunder 101, 32 113, 65 123, 58)

n and *t* 119, 200 (Bī *na paṣyanti* instead of *topasyanti* D and T) 86, 111 (*anāyanti* for *anāyanti*, as Kern corrected already in 1866). Sometimes the particle of interrogation *nu* has become to *kr*, as 54, 258 (D has here also the corrupt reading) 71, 57 78, 107

nn and *ti* Bī put *tatva* for *tan na* 16, 178 101, 230 106, 157, and inversely 106, 90 Cp. also 105, 73 A somewhat comic result of that interchange is met with 65, 46, where Br makes a Bodhisattva gratify living beings and Piçīs by „presents of water and jewels” (T II, 104), while the poet meant *jalair annair* (with water and food) not *jalair ratnair*, as we read in Br The same mistake impairs 66, 154 Instead of *ghanair ratnair ca* (Bī) D has *ghanair annair ca*, the evident meaning of the passage is clear from cl 153 *preṣayām asa pakṣannām dhanair ca* An instance of putting *ta* into the text instead of *ni* occurs 57 106

t and *bh* *abhi* for *ati* 35, 115 inversely *t* 99, 50 Bī has wrongly *atyatusyat* for *abhyatusyat* (D) At 77, 13 Br misread *sabhyam* ‘judge, umpire’, and put *satyam* into his text, D rendered to the verse its true wording *niṣṭayayatha sabhyam tam rajaputram upayathuh* The inverse error, *sabhya* for *satya*, occurs 56, 217 The plain and appropriate expression of this śloka *tae chrutā dayakamsam sa mata satyabhibhasanam mumoca Damayanti tam etam asti iti vadim ||*

as it is edited in D ¹⁾, is miserably perplexed in Br, where the word *sabhyabhibhasanam* deceived Tawney, who (I, 560) translates „she thought that the celestial swan was a polished speaker” instead of ‘— spoke the truth Here Bochtlingk detected the mistake of Br, see Petr Dict VII, 671 s v *sabhya* in fine

r and *ri* 10, 107 (*traya* for *tritaya*) 26, 269 Br = 271 D (*trṣu* for *trisu*) Likewise *r* for *ra* 105, 157, see T II, 159 n 3 Other samples may be 55, 139 *tatah sa samprāpya punah*

¹⁾ Where it is cl 16

śarāṅgāyāṃ (B₁ spoils this line editing *tataḥ samam prapya* etc.) 68 11 *udghāṭat*, misread by B₁ as *udātāt*, see PWK II, 234 s. v. *udātāt*, 88, 52 *śaṅkubhūḍa apī karmanā* (D), where B₁ has *śaṅkubhūḍa*, 103, 5 where B₁ against the obvious sense put *raspeṣu* instead of *śasyeṣu* the wrong reading *uṣṇa* for *uṣṇa* at 87, 30 and 121 136 B₁ [= 135 D], cp. '1's note on II, 619 the confounding of *uṣṇāṇā* with *i* and *e* at 19, 73 and 25 201 — in the former place D has *mahimā dabhayo*°, in the latter *te* (B₁ *taṃ*) — 7, 84 *saṃutpadya* B₁ seems to represent a misread *saṃutṣāya* (D) 13, 13 *saṃtaka* (Br) a misread *maṣṭaka* (D) and 73, 7 *Vicitrakatham atha taḥ* (B₁) a misread *Vicitralatlasamyā* *kaṃ* (D)

Mistakes such as putting *eta* for *na* (13, 117, 20 102 55, 131 120, 62) or inversely (111, 76) *etam* for *ekam* (123 171) *eta* for *eka* (25 197) *hita* for *hata* (20 226 75 95) or inversely (84 8), *apekṣa* for *upakṣa* (17 12) or inversely (70 17) *apalīya* for *upakīya* (93, 68) *ayam* for *aham* (21 25 24 169) *viṣṇuḥ* for *viṣṇuḥ* (34 216) *gana* for *guna* or inversely (e g 15, 368) and the like may be caused partly by incorrect reading of the MSS, partly also by not correcting ordinary clerical errors wherever common sense convinces them. The ingenious word of B₁ in the Preface of the first Volume (p. IX) that he nowhere has put into the text any conjecture not backed by MSS authority practically resulted towards preferring occasional abduction of his intellectual faculties to disregarding a palpable corrupt tradition in the MSS which he happened to have the use of.

The confusion between *ḍ* and *v* and between the different sibilants in his MSS made him now and then take a wrong way. Of the former kind t 123, 175 and 191 afford good instances. In both places B₁ writes *janyatalakam* which should be written *janyabalakam* as is edited indeed in D = 'the company of the bridegroom's friends' (I II 602). As to the sibilants B₁ sometimes puts *duṣa* for *duṣa* fisherman (e g 52 337) *teṣa* for *teṣa*. A remarkable mistake is t 20 122 *aṣṭa ca* (B₁) for *astā ca* (D) which could be easily made since *sta* and *su* can be very similar in manuscripts. Another t 101 13 *bisani* spelt *uṣani*.

Another source of errors was effected by his singular method of separating the words and word-complexes, something very proper to produce errors of any kind. In the 2^d and 3^d volumes the

) Henceforward LW denotes the Leipzig Dictionary PWK the Leipzig Det. in kürzerer Fassung

necessity of transcription added to this other fresh opportunities of mistakes. In a very great number of places *a* is printed where *ā* is meant or ought to be meant, or inversely. See e.g. T II, 332 n 1 — appetains to t 93, 73 —, PW V, 1468 s v *tāṇana*, VI, 833 s v *ias* + *a* at the end, t 107, 118 (*hanta* for *hanta*), all cases of *a* erroneously put for *ā* — Examples of the inverse mistake are e.g. 12, 93 *rājānīlīm* (sic B₁) for *rājānīlīm* (T I, 383 understood it rightly), 52, 334 *phalahaka* for *pha* 62, 182 71, 191. 72, 56, 344 103, 61, cp also PW V, 1491 s v *dari*, VII, 414 s v *racurya* (t 89, 57 to be added) and VII, 456, *samyatṛikā* Kathās- 80, 30 fehlerhaft für *samyatṛikā*! Even a few instances occur in the first volume with nāgaṇ types 25, 284 *pāpacarāu* for *pāpacarāu*, ib 203 and 17, 93 (see PW I, 739 s v *asudhāra*)

Sometimes the aspirate consonant is erroneously put instead of the non aspirate one or inversely 14, 16 (*kh* for *k*) 16, 46 74, 210 101, 186 (*dh* for *d*) 19, 65 (*kh* for *k*) 22, 240 (*d* for *dh*, cp T, I, 185 n, D confirms his emendation) 39, 161 (*b* for *bh*) 46, 199 (*ignā[h]* for *ighnā[h]*) 90 12 (*adrcyah* for *adhr̥cyah*, cp T II, 308 note) 110 14 and 98 (*dh* for *d*) A similar kind of error through transcription is *nd* for *nd* 9, 7 (*danda* instead of *danda*) 9, 9 (*Sandilya* instead of *Ṣandilya*) Once, by a similar inadvertence, writing *l* for *d*, B₁ destroys the *pointe* of a saying (t 54, 92)

Another kind of mistakes consists in wrongly dividing the *scriptio continua* of his MSS. At 7, 17 Br edits the second line thus *sa ca 'aratirna devit̐hetasya 'eva mīmīkanyaka*, where he had to divide *sa ca 'aratirna devit̐hetasya 'eva*. At 13, 23 *sahasṭikapañ camah*, *sa* is erroneously made part of the compound, D severs it from the rest¹⁾ the inverse mistake of separating *sa*, where it is part of a compound, occurs e.g. 15, 109, in the next cl *tad vtsuham* is printed instead of *tadutsuham*. Similar faults are numerous in B₁ T I, 100 note writes "I read with a MS in the Sanskrit College — *bhāyade hā murta na sahase*", Br had before him the same reading but misunderstood his text, dividing it as follows *bhāya-dehāmūrta na sāhase* (t 43, 202), which is devoid of sense, of a similar nature are T's notes on I, 412 (t 16, 172), II 311 (t 95, 35 Br), 398 note 4 (t 103, 41), 411 note 1 (t 107, 62) and on p 406 and 612, T (II, 105) tacitly corrects the

¹⁾ Cp also 83, 31 111, 70 The sly *sibca' a de* is 70, 10 and 171, 20 erroneously into *sa brahmacā* 111

nonsensical reading of 71¹ 27 B₁, and elsewhere KLRN corrected some of these mistakes in his *Remarks in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* of 1868, p. 168 foll. In some cases the wrong analysis would have been concealed, if the editor had used nūgarī types and in the usual way. Of the kind is t 45, 399 *tattam* wrongly for *tat tam* t 50 121 „ „

Devya'alam pṛeṣitā tam pratyādiṣṭam ca layā tara
where is the line must be read °*pṛeṣitā tām praty adīṣṭam ca* etc
t 54, 149

opagyan sa śubham lagnam paṇyan na śalunam sah,
where the obvious meaning of the context compels to divide *paṇyan* *aśakunam*, cp PW VII, 13 s v *śaluna* with a°, t 86, 59 *ya ac* *śairam* are two words, not one compound we have here an instance of the turn *na parāṇi ya at* v = not only but also, cp my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 180 R 1¹). Sometimes B₁ was wrong in his distribution of two words amalgamated by eventual contraction of final and initial vowel into a (*ya va ra*). At 91, 97 it is said of a boy seven years old that even at this age he always took pleasure in benefiting his fellow men in good Sanskrit this must be expressed *sada parahite vatah*, B₁'s analysis *sada aparahite vatah* is against the idiom. Other instances are 16, 40 (see I s note at I 111) 25 200 (*ayantam* for *yantam*) 73 77 (see I s note 2 at II 195). A similar fault is committed 101 91 — to read *stlane llatu* B₁'s *stlane* is impossible since this should be connected with the preceding words *lhatu* would become the first word of the sentence.

In sundry cases B₁ erroneous distinction of the *scriptio c. d. m.* deceived him; I adduce some instances.

T 21, 24 King Vāṇarājan talks his queen that he is troubled with anxiety about a suitable marriage for their daughter Kankarekhi. The poet makes him use this elegant turn of phrase that she is growing up together with his care thereabout *vardhaman saha vataṭṭamanodivahacintaya* / eva Kanakarekhi me Iṭṭayaṇi deva *budhate*. B₁ destroyed the savour of the expression as he edited *vardhamana asaha eva vataṭṭamanodivahacintaya* etc., a nonsensical phrase, which prevented T from catching the intention of Somadeva.

Tar 16 147 and 118 contain a theory about dreams. They are threefold: one kind of dreams betokens something different from that what is dreamt, a second kind foretells the very

) This turn is frequent in Kathās. See I s 96 23, 6; 27 11 29, 1; 3 4, 91
22 54 118 39

events which one has seen asleep, a third kind has no significance at all. In the text the three types are distinguished as *parāṛtha*, *yathāṛtha* and *apārtha*. In D the two śloka run thus

*śvapnāḥ cānekadhā 'nyārtho yathārtho 'partha eva ca,
yāḥ sadyah sūcayaty artham anyārthah so 'bhudhyate ||
prasannadevatūdeśarūpak śvapno yathārthakah,
gādhānubhavaścintūdikītam āhur apārthakam ||*

This is plain and interesting. Bī has edited the former śloka in this corrupted form

*śvapnāḥ ca 'aneka dhanyārtho, yathārtho 'pārtha eva ca
yāḥ sadyah sūcayaty artham dhanyārthah so 'bhudhyate*

Is it wonder that Tawney was perplexed how to get any sense out of it? see T I, 441 with note 1

At 121, 169 Br finding in his MSS *devāgāreḥ śaunūya* = „for contemplating the temple”, divided it in this manner *devāgāre ḥ śaunūya*, by which T (II, 380) was adduced to translate „took that wicked ascetic] to the temple for a moment”. It suffices to read the whole passage to understand the awkwardness of the reading of Br.

A remarkable misunderstanding of Bī disturbs the meaning of 59, 29. He took the first two syllables of the complex *māyeyaropayogitvat* for containing the proper name *Maya*. Hence T, having to translate these lines

devayam Castraganjakhyaḥ catvaredadharah śukah, (28)

kaṇih kṛtsnāsu vidyāsu kalusu ca vicakṣanah

māyeyaropayogitvāt ihānito 'dya, gṛhyatam (29)

rendered them as follows „King, here is a priest that knows the four Vedis, called Śāstraganja, a poet skilled in all the sciences and the graceful arts, and I have brought him here to-day *by the order of king Maya*, so receive him” (II, 19). The words I have italicized in this translation are to be corrected. There is no question of a king *Maya*. The Bhilla maiden simply says „I have brought him here” (*māya ihānitaḥ*) „since he is suitable for a lord” (*īcaropayogitvat*). In fact, *upayogitva* does not mean „order”, but signifies the being *upayogin* i.e. „suitable, fit, of utility”, cp 15, 127-113, 18 (*kim cānyānuṣayoginyā lakṣmya vidyudatilolayā*) — Another instance of a proper name existing only in the idea of Br, but not really found in Somadeva's poem is *Devayānam* 30, 130. Here must be read, as is in D *deva jñāniti*, *deva* is the voc., and *jñān* is the subject to be construed with the pronoun *evah* in the preceding line.

I could fill some pages more with augmenting the list of errors committed by B and corrected in D — in all the instances quoted D's text is right — but what utility may be obtained from it? What I have stated suffices I believe to prove that the task which Blochhaus took on his shoulders was inadequate to his abilities owing for a great deal certainly to the disfavour of the time he lived in when Sanskrit studies encompassed a very limited area and could be neither broad nor deep. Durgapada's edition, there can be no question about has superseded nowadays the European text of the Kathasaritsagara and has become our sole standard edition, to be consulted and quoted up to that future day when a critical edition in the true sense of these words will have been published.

§ 3

The question may arise, why I have allowed in the foregoing so much room to expatiating on more or less evident mistakes and faults in an obsolete edition which has been replaced by a much better one in which the said errors are set right. I did so firstly because the necessity of putting aside a text which for some decades of years had enjoyed a great authority among the Sanskritists and was much consulted by them required a somewhat extensive account of argument. Secondly it might be of some use to remind editors of the ubiquity of clerical errors in manuscripts the emendation of which in cases of evidence must not be checked by the fortuitous circumstance that the faultless reading is not found in any of the mss. At the disposal of the editor certain permutations of initials owing to paleographical similarity or to likeness of pronunciation *dja* and *gla* *ma ya*, *pa sa za* and *sa i* and *ra a* and *ra ca* and *ra* etc. etc. are so common that a critical editor is not only qualified but even obliged to bring them into account as a sort of cue when establishing the net weight and the value of the readings with which he happens to meet in a gross form in his manuscripts.

The third and I dare say the chief reason that moved me was this. The Petropoliitan Dictionary is very much indebted to the Kathasaritsagara. Blochhaus took care to profit of the lexicographical materials laid up in that important text edited by a competent scholar at a time when the number of Sanskrit works in editions of European scholars was comparatively small. The imperfections of B, which fully came to light by the publication of D, have

left then traces in the Dictionary. Though Boethlingk oftentimes detected and corrected mistakes of Br — vide e.g. *supra* p. 71 72 73 and *infra* p. 77 80 84 — it was something impossible for his perspicacity to be misled nowhere. I think it will be of some profit to make up a list of corrections in PW and PWK chiefly owing to the new light cast on the Kathāsaritāgama by D's edition. In doing which I follow the alphabetical order.

List of corrections to be made in PW and PWK.

- amecatara* = °*tarana* occurs 22, 1 D. The reading of Br °*atura*° implies a metrical blunder.
- atulya* 18 106 is to be cancelled and *atula* to be put in its place. D has *meatunahayogya* 'proper to pass the night'.
- anumitta* 121 181 evil omen, a meaning omitted by mistake.
- anikini* 17, 12 delete the asterisk in PWK.
- anunayana* the *ā-zṣ* *ayana* + t 11 89 does not exist. D has *annathana* (from *nath* *nithate* to beseech) which must be substituted for it. From *anu* + *ni* the nomen actionis ought to be *anunayana* not °*nayana*.
- anupattika* 71 111 etw. *Brief* PW VII 1694. The word seems to take its origin from a blunder of Br. D reads the last pāda of that śloka *laste dattannuyatikan* having given 'in escort in his hand'. Likewise.
- anupatni* 73 110 is to be cancelled. D has *prakṛta anuyayant*.
- anuprasana* 48 101 has been forgotten.
- anivesa* with the meaning of investigator, inquirer is to be added from 123 310 D (= 309 Br). Br has *anestum* but D's reading *anivesan* is preferable. I (II, 609) was perplexed by the mīm.
- apayantranam* adv., a new word 104 34 D. Br has *anyantranam*. The asterisk before *asra* with the meaning 'blood' may be put away. D and the Indian Off. MSS read so at 114 88. Br reads *asrg*°. Cp. I II 513 note 1.
- asisthlyam* is the reading of D in the two places 101 89 and 117, 90 whereas Br reads *astasthlyam* (see PW V, 8 v).
- ap* + *prati* desid. PW V, 1108 *weisen um* (ein Mädchen) *that anuyastha + pratipya tam*. This unaccountable signification of the desid. of *prati* + *ap* is false. Br did not understand the passage. D reads the line in question *etadarttham tam ahitas, tatsv anuyastha + pratipysata* (c. *mayi*), and is

evidently right in doing so. The \tilde{z} - ε , *pratīpsati* is here synonymous with *abhipṣati*, as might be expected a priori. *āhutaṇḍya* PW V, 1134 idj *herbeizumufen* Kathās 110, 111 eine ungrammatische Form. D has the regular gerund *āhutaṇḍya*! cp PWK I, 197

As to *udghata* and *upodghata* t 71, 295 I refer to the following chapter

uparibhūmi subst. ॐ, 70 not mentioned neither in PW nor in PWK. The latter mentions only *uparibhūmi* adv.

upasamkhyā PW V, 1191 and PWK I, 215, which Boethlingk was at a loss how to explain must be cancelled. For *upasamkhyā* t 71, 278 B, D has *upasamkhyām*. The right reading, I think, is *upasamkhyam* = 'towards the battle, -the war, in *uparibhūmi* T II, 228 has found out the right explanation of this *śloka*.

umbhita, quoted from t 51, 186 in PW V 1200 s v *ubh*, is a good correction of Boethlingk. B has *ratnastambhobhitabhogam*. The correction is confirmed by D. And not only here, but also in three places more *umbhita* has been restored in D, where B had failed to recognize that participle 49, 1 (*sunirmalaḥsumombhitā* B *°summitā*) 71 135 (*adyā saptaśarombhitā*, B *°ommitā*) 117 11 (*tatra ratnombhita stambha*° B *tatra ratnastambastambha*°). It may be rendered 'made up of, beset with'. I think it is indeed as is commonly accepted akin to the idg root **ubh* **ubh*, the offspring of which *manubhi* is a welcome guest in linguistic handbooks. Of the Rgvedic instances quoted in PW I s v *ubh* I hold but one for belonging to this root *ubh* viz RV 1 1 15 the other two having a quite different meaning — 1 63 1 *Vitram ubhuk* you killed [or vexed, or oppressed] *Vitram* and similarly 1 19 1 cp Summary on both passages — must be referred to another root *ubh*.

ullughayati 'to herd' lat 72 107 is a new instance to be added to the two recorded in PW V 1201 and PWK I 203. D and T's Crivellu MS read *ullughayan*, see P II, 191 note, in B it has been corrupted into *ullughayan*. I found also a good instance in *tantrikhyāyika* (ed Hertel) II, 77.

ekaka and *ekika*. The distribution of these two forms of the fem of *ekaka*, instanced PW V, 1217 from Kathās, is the same in both B and D. Only add t 73 196 where D has *ekika*, B *ekika*.

- lampra* A new instance of this adj. is t. 52, 49 D *lopakam prangasamdhikam*. This is preferable to *lopakampa*° Br Cp *dypra* infra.
- karṇin* PW II, 127. Cancel the meaning 2 b), Steuermann-Schiffsmann Kathās 25, 68'. It rests on the bad reading of B₁ D reads *sudhayaṣṣaṭi catā te/ṣṭam dīpantaragacchadvantī arṇaparampara*. The term *karṇaparampara* = 'oral tradition, hearsay' is well known and recorded in PW even from the Kathās.
- karṇiratha* 'covered litter'. To the few instances registered in PW and PWK we may add Kathās 27, 168, where it is found in both editions, and two more passages met with only in D — the second of them also in 1 s MS — 91, 91 and 120, 118. Br in both cases failing to recognize the word, has torn it asunder, destroying the sense.
- karṇajapa* is taught by Purni (3.2.13) and recorded in PW and PWK occurs Kathās 60.54 D. The form *karṇajapa* found in B₁ is a monstrous lectio and must be cancelled in PW V. 1208 and in PWK II.
- kalana* s. v. *kalana* PW V, 1265. The proposal of Boehtl. to correct the meaningless reading of t. 100.57 Br *diṣa kalataya gira* etc. is superseded by the right reading of D *drakṇīṭaṭaya gira pramadamanthararamblaya* with eyes troubled (by agitation) and a voice faltering with joy.
- kakaraṇḥin* 32.32 must be registered in the lexicon as a nickname for a superstitious person who sees omens in everything.
- kacara* PW V, 1275 is also found t. 20.108 D (B₁ *kalara*) and t. 123.164 D (B₁ *lekara*). *kacaraṇḥin* and *kacaralocanaḥ*.
- karṇama*. A good instance of *karṇama* = 'voice' is t. 26.198 D *tatra capacyad ekāṭi sadhitanekakarmanam maluvatinam ekakam*. The word is hidden under a corruption apud B₁.
- karsaka* is instanced PW V from t. 62.20.23 B₁ D has here *karsika*. The same form occurs in both editions 61, 7.9.
- kinnari* as name of a musical instrument 37, 64 D, where Br has *kinnara* cp. PW II, 284 to be added in PWK s. v. 3 b).
- Kosala* f. Kathās 56.115. PW V, 1332 is to be cancelled. Br wrongly adopted a vicious reading of one or more of his MSS. D reads in this stanza (114 of his ed.) *jaṣṣama Kosalaṇ*, as it ought to be.
- kottastha* t. 49.68 B₁ is doubtless a corrupted reading. D reads *kottasthāṇi Smaheccarāṇi*.
- Kubayasi* t. 101.126 B₁. The reading of D is *kūḷiyase* a form,

not registered in PW nor PWK, but more conform to the rules of grammar

ṣam caus PW II, 532 adduces one instance from the Rāmāyana for the meaning „etwas geduldig ertragen“ Lest one might acknowledge another instance in Kathās 39, 236 Bt *ṣamayasiā*, I observe that the line in which this imperative occurs is too long by one syllable D reads that line *tatāparādham ekaṁ team ṣamasaṣaṣām kṛpām kuru* and so restores both the metre and the idiom

galla, a prākṛitism for *ganda*, is illustrated by a few instances from literature in PW V, sv Add to them Kathās 63, 155, where D *utpinocchunagallam* is evidently right (Bt has *°galam*), cp Atri's Diet sv and the instance produced from Kāvya-prakāśa, a parallel to the Kathās passage

grāha as a nomen actionis is treated in PW II and PWK II sv. under c) In PW v S the meaning „Kampfanstrengung“ = *anodyama* is taken from dictionaries, not instanced from literature An excellent instance is Kathās 50, 53 D, where Bāhuvā urges India to cease the hostilities *sandham kṛnta śam grāhāḥ* „make peace, what have you to do with endeavours to fight one another“ Bt has here a somewhat bewildering reading *sandham kṛnta vigrāhāḥ* (50, 54 Bt)

grāhika quoted as ḡ-ṣṣ εἰρημεν from t 19, 16 Br in PW II „hartnäckig auf etwas bestehend“ D reads here *grāhika*, likewise an ḡ-εἰρ

The interesting word *ghanāghana*¹⁾ occurs t 16 121 D, where Bt *ghanāghama* is manifestly the bad reading

ghrā + *ann*, (to kiss) instanced in PW VII 1103 with one place in Kathās (113, 50), must be cancelled Bt's text is here corrupted by a mis-reading, D *pitroh pudai annahyaya* honouring his father-and-mother's feet

cau, *cau* PW II, 983 „a kind of pepper“ The instance adduced there from Kathās 6, 151 is owing to a mistake of Bt and must be cancelled Instead of the non-sensical *Caratarmā caṭhasṭab* D has *ṭhasṭab Caratarmā ca ṭhasṭa* = „perplexed, at a loss“ (PWK VI, 110 sv 1 d)²⁾ Other instances in Somadeva are 90, 15 (*ṭhasṭatā*) and the participle *ṭhasṭita* (101, 98)

cirandhi PW V, 1123 quoted from Kathās 58, 56 and repeated

1 2

¹⁾ Cp *Altam Kern*, p 43

²⁾ BOUTINCKE apud LAMMAS, Sanskrit Reader p 52 corrected *Caratarmā ca ṭhasṭab*

in PWK II 132 does not exist at all D reads here *cirantiṣu* conformably to the form known by grammarians and lexicographers. We have here the Belegstelle from literature for *ciranti* 'old spinster'. The word, methinks is a prakritism and a *tadblāva* of skrt *cirayanti* (चिरयन्ति) which has got the special meaning of 'staying (too) long (at the paternal home in stead of being transported to the home of a husband)

cira PW V 1423 Bochtlingk's suspicion that *cira* Kathas 73 240 (Br and D) should be corrected into *ciri* is fully confirmed by the parallel passage t 87 32 where D and 1 Ms (see his note 2 at II 295) agree in reading *ciricāḥaia* against *cira*° Br At 73 210 the same must be corrected by conjecture

chata 62 213 Br is obscure. Some villagers, it is told took a buffalo belonging to a certain man and *miti i ratatale chata i de vyapadya blakvatal* [वि नालिस ताल]⁴ Instead of this out of place absolute D reads *blallat*. The villagers were Bhils

Of *glampa* and *°p* jump (see PWK III 281) but one instance is quoted from Katha in PW V s v. There are two more but Br has them not since they are hidden under corrupt readings. The former is t 103 8 in D it runs thus

*utphelut blallatunin surumst blvajastinon
dus dattordhijajastipunt dnyastin na cumbita i*

(jumping, as if it were upward to the *ka* to *kās* the heavenly maidens) [Br *utphetur blruastinon dattordhijaja i mahijastir* (ie or is here some hypothetical error?) And t 115 68 D has *dattajastipatid bluci*

(cp f II 517 n 1)

du ara t 100 14 Br (see PW V s v) is a bad reading. D has *jaya tmdavadarib er i raida*° I transport this quotation to *dai bara* cp. 107 5

°daqlna reaching to. Add to the few instances from literature mentioned PW III s v, Katha 101 291 D *hulyalalaqln occlatalilulan* (Br *gulplalagho*), cp 1 II 351 n 2

dari try t 19 210 Br is a misprint for *davidro* (19, 208 D), cp 7 I 169 n. Happily PW does not record the vitiated word

dipra taught by Panini 3, 2, 167 and exemplified by the *kaṣika* with *dipra i kṣṣa i* occurs five times in the Kathas, once in t 25 where it is found in both editions which place i

registered in PW III s v, and four times in the latter part of the poem, where it stands only in D, not in Br t 101, 28 106, 61 182 110, 11 (Br everywhere changed, it seems, *dipin* into *dipta*)

duryana, as adj PW, V 1500 Its form is met with f 39, 226 Br reads *rajanā duryana* (acc pl), but D *duryanā duhsarpa* 'cruel hose Schlinger' quoted from t 99, 46 in PW, V 1505 is a misleading Br divided the words of the line wrongly In D 99, 46 c and d run thus *ta te priya racu yat ta kurva' / tvaṁ me bandhuk sarpa damṣartiharta* therefore perform what I tell you moved by friendship! you are my relative, you who have relieved me from the distress caused by the bite of the serpent 1 v (II 361) translation is accordingly to be rectified

dha + *gam* + *vi* causative 'to suspend (a punishment) Kathas 27, 31 lacks in PW and PWk

dhanūdhruvā, rightly interpreted by Boethlingk (PW, III s v) notwithstanding Br's mistake in t 6, 62, also occurs t 84, 9.

dhūrmika with the special meaning of 'pious, religious man devotee' to be instanced with Kathas 66 8 foll

Dhrtatala is registered = *Vetala* in PW, V s v from Kathas 69, 115 D has here *Vetalah* instead of *Dhrtatalah*

dhyā + *pa* + *m* PW, III and V, s v The instance quoted V 1529 from Kathas 101 125 is false D has *atha m pram dhayati m abhāt* The other instance taken from the Bhāgavatapurāṇa must likewise be wrong *pa idadhyau* is a miswritten or misread *pramadadha*

naṣṭatamala = 'strung of (27) pearls' PW gives but one instance from literature of this meaning It is met with in Kathas four times 91, 31 91, 62 100 1, (with a double meaning) 118, 161

narmada adj 'jesting' is wholly out of place Kathas 56 365 Br whence it has been instanced PW, IV 61 In D (56 364) Damayanti says more conformably to the situation *ta tada nayane yuktā manmatā kṛiyatām iyaṁ* (the countenance which I have 'approved')

numaganaka 61, 252 D, v would be astrologer an astrologer nominally, not really This &² etc is to be added to the two other examples of compounds of this type *numanan* and *numayajña* Br failed to see that *numaganakah* 11 is one word, he wrongly divided *numa ganakah*

nūśaka = *nūśa* 28, 141 Br and D is wanting in the Dictionary.
nirangi 'veil' A new instance of this rare and decay-word is 71,
 167 D *tām Kāmālākara upayame sanirangim* „K wed-
 ded her, who had veiled her face” D explains the word
 in a foot-note *mukhūcchādanavastram nirangity ucyaṭe*. Br
upayame sa gaurangim 1)

pādapā = 'hoe' is recorded in PW, V But also the msc. *pādapa*
 occurs in this meaning Kathās 67, 97 (both Br and D),
 this is wanting in PW and PWK

paśanda The fem *ṛ* occurs 61, 290 Br (cp PWK III, s v),
 D reads *pukhandā* for *pāśandi*

piṇjarika (name of some musical instrument) registered in PW V,
 1600 from t, 65, 75, 78 Br, is written *piṇjaraka* in D
prāsthānika, not *piasthānika*, as in Br's ed, is indeed found t.
 31, 38 D, cp PW IV s v *prasthānika* I think, *kṛta-*
prāsthānikā means „after performing the auspicious rite con-
 nected with the undertaking of a journey”, cp the passages
 from Rāmāyana and Raghuvamśa quoted in PW II and the
 word *mūṅgalika* infra Tawney (I 278) translates as if it
 simply meant 'setting out'

preṣṭha To the few instances of this superl may be added t 101,
 15 D (*puram preṣṭhāya*, Br *purapṛiṣṭaya*)

1 *phat* + *ut* in PWK, III s v 'The meaning to bounce up',
 instanced there with a passage of the Balaamayana is also
 met with Kathās 108, 132 D *hūro utagatai cakṣavy*
utphalañ śasataḥ kiudhā Br has *utphullah*, an evident
 corruption, of course

balurāja t 95, 4 means I suppose, 'tributary king' Cp the note
 on this śloka in Chapt II

bandhavi PW V, 1647 and PWK IV s v 2) must be cancelled
 The sole instance given of it Kathās 121, 243 Br, is not
 confirmed by D Instead of *bhartrbandhavai* it has *bhartr-*
bandhar yān [mrgam etc, the abl of the abstract noun
bandhaviya, not the dative of an hypothetical *bāndhavi*

bhā 'to please' is not found in PW, in PWK's v it is recorded
 and exemplified with one instance from Boehtlingk's *Chresth* 2
 227, s [= (K 15 3) schol on Pāṇini 2, 3, 2] *bobhukṣitam na*
pati bhāti kimeṣa, and Boehtl doubts, whether *pratibhāti*
 should not rather be taken for one word He did not mind
 Kathās 21, 142 *bhāti c gen eva bhāty asya na*

1) T II, 1: 2 translates accordingly „marriage that fair hoped marriage”

'whether this man *pleases* him or not' *Bhāṭi* c gen, therefore, = *rocātī* c gen

mada with the meaning 'musk' [= *mrgamada*] is registered with an asterisk in PWK (V, 12 s v l). It is met with in Kathās t 82, 83, but lies hidden under a corruption in Bī. In D this *śloka* is edited thus *yeyam crikhandakarpurakālāṅguram adottamam / līlaprasādhanaṁ* etc

mahātāla is not 'kostbares Öl', as it has been rendered in PW and PWK, but 'human fat'. See Tawney I, 306 n and his translation of t 73, 306 and 99, 4, cp also *mahāmāmsa māṅgalika*. To the one instance of meaning 2) registered in PWK, V s v this may be added Kathās 115, 156. D has doubtless the right reading *Čakrah Čaciracīlamāṅgalīlāh prastāhe*, Br 'mangalalāh

mantrika, 'schlichter für *mantrika*' PW and PWK s v. Likewise Kathās 121, 12 Br *mantrilāh* is corrected in D *māntilā o diplamantīo* 'pn etc

yuddhaka = *yuddha* PW, VI s v and PWK, V s v must be cancelled. The sole place, where it is found, is Kathās 49, 71. Bī King Mūrtiśena, while besieging some vassal (*kottastha*, cp *supra*, p 79 s v *kostastha*) is himself besieged by Vikramākti. Being thus obstructed, he says to his excellent minister Guṇaṇman

*ekam yuddhe sthitah santo yuddhak sma nyena śatruṇa
tad idam aparyupitah katham yudhyamahe dayoh'*

= „While we are occupied in besieging one enemy we are besieged by another, so now how we are to fight with two enemies, as we are unequal in force? (T I, 162) and asks this question more

ayuddhe yuddhake irah sthasyamaḥ ca tīyacram'

What may this mean? Strictly speaking *ayuddhe yuddhake* even if the latter word should be = *yuddhe*, is here nonsensical, and P's translation, without fighting a battle is very forced. But D has *ayuddhe yuddhake irah* etc, that solves the riddle. *Ruddhaka* = 'enclosure' or rather the state of being enclosed, besieged'. Transl. „how long, being brave men, are we to be kept shut in, without fighting?'

śathuṇaṇman Boehtlingk's correction (PW, VI s v) of Kathās 104, 112 is confirmed by D. The same error of Br against the genuine reading of D is also met with t 55, 116

1 *ras* PW, VI s v. The instance quoted Kathās 108, 106 is false. Not *rasat* (Bī) but *lavat* (D) is the right reading. The

compound in full is *raktatīptalasaṭkhaḍgalatujihva* the sword red with blood is compared to a tongue Cp T II 455, n 1

vajjalilayita an *z-* *et* registered in PW VI s v as occurring Kathas 43 59 and repeated in PWK, represents the reading of Br only D has *vajñā lilayitam*

Of *rista* (n) = 'distress calamity' registered in PW, VI s v 1 ris 3) a certain instance is Kathas 115 54 D The 4th pada of this śloka *tanuam ristam svarāṣṣam na* preparing calamity as if it were to the celestials represents doubtless the genuine text Br s *tanuam ristam* is a corruption thereof, T is at a loss how to explain it see his n 1 on II, 517 — The variance t 116 4 *tany arisam* (D) *tany arisam* (Br) is more doubtful At 119 160 both editions have *amstaṣankināh*

ru + *at* + *a* PW VI s v *Ityarudha* exorbitant is the right reading Kathas 61 251 (D) not *anyarudha* Br which is void of sense in that context

luth + *us* With respect to the caus PW and PWK omit to mention the meaning to demolish to overturn [a building] Kathas 76 30 Br and D and 121 180 D In the latter place Br has erroneously put into the text *nirlocya tad* (I II 580 take this into consideration and) instead of *nirloṭhya tad* demolish this (temple) and [level it with the earth]

1 *ca* PW VI 820 The meaning 2) unter Imds Befehlen stehend unterthan abhängig is among other instances, exemplified with Kathas 81 102 But D has *sapnuṣam ca* *ca* *tava* [not *ca* as Br] agreeably to the usual idiom

vidhiraṇa PW VI 1056 The meaning sub 3) *d* *da* Abwesen, Zurückweien instanced with Kathas 26 63 is based on the wrong reading of this śloka in Br The right one is edited in D

*tona vity Haris tistam taran ullhato talin
pitur vidhiraṇam kṛte kanyavalyupjalam sthite ||*

T's translation (I 223) For the reason though my father has recommended to me many Vidudhara suitors I have rejected them all and remained unmarried up to this day is accordingly in want of a slight modification She does not say she rejected the suitors but she *checked* (*clashed* / *stopped*) her father in his design This is the meaning of *vidhiraṇa* to the instances thereof quoted in PW, add

Avadānaçatakā I 223, 15 *bhagavan rajamāge nyatamena brahmanena vidharita itī* — Blochhaus must have written *vidānam* by some mistake of the kind as is pointed out, *supra* p 72

vidhura substantive = *sapatni* (Kāthās 39, 55) is not mentioned in PWK

visātra is exemplified in PW s v with but two instances, one from the Rgvedasamhitā and one from the classic Sanskrit. This place is Kāthās 20, 157 B, but D has *sarātra*. An exact account of the evidence to be obtained from manuscripts is much wanted here but it is missing!

vanatya Blochhaus! PW s v, understood that this *ā-* is in 60, 145 B is a corruption and conjectured *vanatyaṃ etī* 'becomes estranged'. D has *vanitāṃ etī*, which is doubtless the genuine reading.

cabala PW s v establishes the meaning 1 c) 'entstellt verändert' and quotes several instances from the Bhāgavata purāṇa. Kāthās 51, 235 D is a new instance *īamarohapariṣṭānam cabalaḥ dīamarasana* = in the mind of those abandoned to the intoxication of love the idea of duty and religion is distorted. Br has *capala* instead of *cabala* a bad reading which disfigures the purport of the sentence.

318 + *sarī* + *ut* The partic *samīcchita* = ritually impure is forgotten in PW VII s v 3 318.

1 the causative 4) PW s v. The meaning 'reinigen' is exemplified with one instance. Kāthās 19, 84. But D has not *asocayati* but *asodhayati* (*dusitam tīratayati pratigayati asodhayati*) which is preferable for this reason that *sodhayati* 'purifies' is conformable to *śuddhaye* is pure but not so *socayati* with this meaning 'to locate'. For this reason I think *Varanasi* Yogavittā 7, 11 (Ind. Studien XV, 168) *socayati* is also to be corrected into *sodhayati* cp PWK s v. *uc*

ceṣya PW VI, 299 but Sate zu lassen 'fernerer Berichtigung nicht werth' is instanced with but one case. Kāthās 74, 213 where this meaning is forced. I II 225 translates (to be) only worthy of neglect which lies still farther off. In fact, the gerundive of *ṣi* is not at its place in the passage quoted, and D has instead of it *śālpak* = very insignificant. Br's *ceṣya* is certainly corrupt and must be cancelled in the Dictionary.

samjāna 'The quotation Kāthās 101, 188 in PW VII s v 1 a) is to be put aside. Since there is no question there of

resuscitation", but simply of life' opposite to death', D's reading *sa jīvanapramāyayoh* etc. is the right one, not Br *samjūana*^o

samnyasa with the meaning of 'rejoice' 'Uebererlebung', PW VII, 654 s.v. 4) and PWK VII 16 s.v. 5) does not exist at all. The sole instance of it, the quotation Kathas 4, 36 Br is corrupt. Instead of *kītasamnyasa* D has *kītasamdhāsa*, it is *samtha* not *samnyasa* that means 'Uebererlebung'. *saptaka* n. 'Heptad'. The quotation Kathas 43, 13 in PW VII s.v. should rather be omitted. D has the good reading *mastaka* instead of *saptaka* (Br) and reads accordingly the line in this manner *mayā casya samānapurīma astakāyobhinah / abhyan taram* etc. = he entered within it [viz. that place] which possessed the greatest beauty of the Golden Town.

sabha jayati to render homage (to) is mistaken in PW with Kathas 62, 8. It occurs also Kathas 16, 25. D *tatal sabhajayann anyan* etc. where Bi falsely reads *tatal sa bhajayann*, for the pronoun *sah* is already present in the same sentence. Likewise Bi disregarded *sabha jana* in Kathas 15, 362 *sabha janaya ca prapāt Prahlādasya abham jayan* he reads *sa bhajanaya* — to take his meals (I I 131) destroying thereby the meaning of that passage as Somadeva intended to say that he went to the hall of P. to pay his respect.

sampadati t. 4) 366 must be a false form as Boettlingk supposed already. PW VII s.v. The Babu Svami Churn's conjecture *sammadati* mentioned by I I 131 n. and recorded PWK VII 68 is certainly right. Somadeva uses the word *sammada* (joy) oftener than should be inferred from the few quotations of it from Kathas in PW s.v. It occurs also 19, 64 D *caradati dattasammadah* (Br *°samyadah*) 26, 287 *samīnadamayin dācam* (both edit.) 104, 51 D *datta samadati* cp. I II, 114 n. 2, 108, 121 too, D has *bheje kamapi sammadam* against Bi *kamapi sampadam*.

śilayyaka quoted PW s.v. from Kathas 17, 18 and 55, 208 is spelt in both places *śilayaka* in D. Yet cp. PWK s.v.

śulita 'saturated'. To the scanty instances from classical Sanskrit, quoted in PW s.v. may be added Kathas 66, 35. Kern's opinion (Journ. R. Asiat. Soc. II) that *suklitasya* (Bi) ought to be corrected into *śulitasya* is fully confirmed by D, where the line runs thus

adhyasya kūr ca dānam śchītasjūnane ca kūr

Suklita for *śulita* is likewise written *Andanacataka* I,

189, 7 cp the Index of my edition s v At Int I 266
11 we have an instance of *sukta* in Pñ

suti 'Niederkunft = child birth The quotation Kathis 61 5
must be cancelled D reads *sutakante* not *sutikale* the
reading of Br The woman goes to the river to bathe at
the end of the *sitala*, the impurity caused by child birth
verily not at the time of her delivery (*sitalala*)¹

sutapitam h and ca s v *sita* 2) Meschum PW and PWH
The signification could be better delimited I 1 93 n 3
translates to test, likewise I 197 where he renders Kathis
21 93 The expression answers, indeed almost to Latin
'periculum facere

sphury + *sam* is to be added in PW and PWH The putic of the
present act of this verb is met with t 96 12 D *tatal*
śajanaśaśpiśpīśjadāramūlatatīnam etc Br has *tatal*
*śajanaśaśpiśjad*²

śaraj Kathis 96, 3 must be cancelled in PW s v The right
reading is *nagareśaral* (D) *śaraj* is a simple appellative
is uncommon and even if it were not so it would be less
proper in that context

śantant I think this \tilde{a} - ϵ in t 37 25 (in both editions)
is genuine (cp the notes of D and I I 336 n 1) and take
it for a synonym of *śanta* = *manes* or *īdaya*

laha I whe! (PW VII s v) Kathis 28 24 D *lal* against
Br *lā la*

§ 4

The possession of a better edition affords also the advantage of
getting rid of some grammatical singularities in the text of the
Kathasaritsāgira about which formerly it was more or less uncer-
tain how to account for They mostly concern verbal forms
and a few syntactical blunders

D is as constant in exhibiting *abhi* as Br in the barbarism
abritam cp Kern Journ R As Soc II p 169 D is not so
correct in the case of ϵ negligently put for *ai* in verbal forms from
the root ϵ e g 37, 51 where the *vikram* says to *śiṣyadatta*
alam yam njanī sthānam arjuna [= redibo] *ca nījātie* both
editions *eyam* against the obvious meaning Likewise I 266
86, 34 etc, 62, 71 to correct *amya akam* for the edited *emy*
alan

Var 16, 72 Br has *labhēya* n, but D *labhēya* the middle voice

as usual. In the same way the uncommon active of $\mu + para$ t 72 67 Br is not found in D it has *vade parajayeta tām* (Br *vade parajayed etam*) Boehlingk's correction *pravecyate* t 45, 247 (PW VI s v *viç + pra*) is confirmed by D — *Bhāṇjam* t 62, 112 is corrupt, D has *bhājan* cp I II 73 n 2

The present of ι (to choose to adhere) according to the 5^t class is met with t 66 109 Br *sattāhinaṇa na ṛmate ṛiyah* D *imate* according to the 9^h class Both forms are grammatically good

The ungrammatical aorist *apavsta* 29 62 Br disappears in D, whose reading *ten epvsta śayampiabhū* (a bhrūvīhi) is doubtless right. On the other hand D restores in two places the aorist of ι (37 197 *upavīksan* 38 102 *pravīksat*) where Br has imperfections which disturb the metre, cp t 12 156

In 1868 Kern (II p 176) had already intimated that *craddatāt* t 103, 93 Br is a monstrum lectionis and should be corrected into *craddatūh*. So indeed is edited in D. The other monstrum *uktavatyau* t 121, 20 is also limited to Br. D has *uktavatyau*. Nor is *Irṣan* or *dīrṣan* (t 53 130 Br) found in D — the line in question is edited there as follows *tac cīrutiana ca so vadid dhrsto* (rejoiced) *Iṇavaro dīyat* — And t 121, 192 where Br produces in absolute *anuvajya* (sic) = having propitiated (see PW VI 232 s v *raj + anu*, caus 2) D has the right reading *anuvajya* likewise D corrects the vicious *vajyāta* t 86 109 of Br it reads *tat/vajyāta si rign* — Another vicious form is the infinitive *viṣṭam*, t 98 15 Br (not mentioned in PW) instead of it D has, of course, *viṣṭi* Kern in his paper mentioned above corrected also *yujatīyat* t 106 21 both editions have the faulty *yijantīyat*

Amantūh t 16, 220 Br is a legitimate various reading of *amantūh*, D. Perhaps also *drdlayati* 16 10 Br of *drallayati* (D) in Prābodhacandrodaya V, stanza 28 Brockhaus like we edited *drdlayati*, whereas the Annals of 1898 of that drama (p 189 st 22) reads *drallayati* also Vivaranda Vidyaśāstra ed of 1871

Has Somadeva used the liberty granted to epic poetry of omitting the adgment? According to Br's edition one would be inclined that he availed himself of that licence but sparingly. The few cases, however, of its being wanting are checked by the veto of D³)

³) T 13 11 D has *abh a d ta* but here (Br) *b n t* is preferable

Compare

Bi	50	160	<i>canurañjayat</i> ,	with D (50, 159) <i>canurañjayat</i>
	51,	209	<i>ativahayat</i> ,	, D <i>atyavahayat</i>
	57,	135	<i>mbadhyata</i>	, D <i>nyabadhyata</i>
	65,	180	<i>pulinany avalokayat</i> ,	, D <i>pulinani yalokayat</i>
	71	51	<i>pravṛṣayāt</i> ,	, D <i>pravṛṣayāt</i>
	96,	16	<i>avalambayam</i>	, D <i>adalambayam</i> , a preferable

reading also for this reason that *avalambayam* *atmanam* — not *mat* — is the typical expression for committing suicide by suspending one's self

Bi 72, 39 *arcayat*, but D *arcayat* Nevertheless, D ordinarily agrees with Bi in the absence of the augment in the case of a verb commencing by *a* followed by two consonants It is especially wanting in the imperfs *arpayat* and *samarpayat* at the end of the 2^d or 1st pāda (10, 100 205 213, 12, 27 172 1) 13, 101, 23, 31, 24, 165, 27, 112 29, 161 33, 17 35, 17, 38, 48 39, 201 13, 127 11, 25 154 45, 179 16, 15, 54 226, 61 288 73 301 74, 267 90, 55 102, 133 105, 25 117 117 119 27 121, 232, 233 123 102 124 314 124 121 197) cp *samarpayata* 70 20 *samarpayata* 72 51 Of the kind we also *asnat* 12, 68 *adasyata* 121, 52 D has also *abhyasyat* 13, 271, but here Bi *abhyasyan* (participle) seems to me the better reading At t 118, 81 D reads *ardayan* *Mala yadhiyān* against Br *ardayat*

Somadeva therefore seems to have altogether abstained from imperfects and torists without augment (the tor with *ina* of course, excluded), save this case of *a* + two consonants In this respect he contrasts with his rival Kāśmirī, who — if we may trust the printed text — admitted of imperfects without augment rather freely e.g. Biḥm p 254, 176 p 413 21 p 151 11 p 153 36 p 456, 76

At t 101, 91 it is D that has the incorrect passive *galyate* the right form *galyate* is in Bi

Several times there is variance in the two editions in such cases, where both forms are good Br has *kaṣṭa* 21, 28 22, 202 61, 161 77, 36 D everywhere *kaṣṭa* The same applies, it seems, to such orthographies as *ḍakṣi* — *ḍakṣi* *loṣṭika* (D) — *kaṣṭikā* 127 — *peḍi* *chagala* — *chagala*, *kuttani* — *kuttini* *picchala* — *pechala*, *bahula* — *bahala*, *kṣurika* — *churika*, *dhattaraka* — *dhustaraka* *praghnika* — *prahnika*, *tittika* — *titika*, *pegusa* — *piyusa*

*) But t 12 64 D has *sa arpayat* against Br *sa arpayat*

In part of them one of the forms is nearer to the original *Pañcī*

From a syntactical point of view it may be observed that D now and then restores *enam* and the like in such cases as where *etam* etc found in B₁ are less correct or inversely, e g. 42, 177 D so 'py *enam* [B₁ *etam*] *agralit*, but 45, 368 D *Sumundikam catlam* [B₁ *ca 'enam*] At t 19, 183 D and 50, 195 D both editions have wrongly *etam* for *enam*

Tu 118, 100 B₁ *yuyam prayatam Patulam* do you much to Patali! D reads *yuyam prayatam* The connection of the plural of the pronoun subject with the dual of the imperative predicate is apparently due to some oversight of B₁ The same must be said of 20, 152 *na etam vadit* B₁, in D we find *manam vadit*, as must be expected a priori and cp the similar passage 103, 47 Nor can I anyhow believe that B₁ found in his manuscripts that which is edited 12, 58 *darabhyam* for *darabhyo* (D) such a dual being unheard of

The rare instance of an accusative cum infinitivo t 20 172 B₁ *erantah kamapi vijunam snatum tatva dadarica ca*, which I have quoted in my *Sanskrit Syntax* p 307 n 3 fills away D reads *snantam*, the participle wanted here!

The 1 pers of the imperative *kathari pibam* t 61 238 B₁, though good in itself had become uncommon in Somadeva's days It is not met with in D which has *kathari pibami* Here and in the preceding case it is impossible to guess how far B₁ went in his modification of the text he found in his manuscripts

Tu 15 400 B₁ contains a modus irrealis expressed by a conditional in the ipodosis and an aorist (!) in the protasis as follows *bhaskarasyad asmathodhugau tam agham iyadhas tac cet* = The fire of my wrath would have reduced thee to ashes, if thou hadst committed that sin Yet it is not Somadeva, but B₁ who is liable to that syntactical sin D reads — and manifestly, he is right — *agham iyadhasyacet*

Here are some other cases of syntactical irregularities put away

1 In t 84 the tenth Veda tale, cl 11 relates that a certain thief saw Mudrasena and rushing upon her, *sewed her by the hem of her garment* (I II, 280) The words I have italicized render B₁'s *kenapi rurudle vasanañcalit* Instead of that abl, which is hard to be accounted for, D has the locative *vasanañcale* conformably to the use, cp my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 139 d — 2 The structure of the sentence t 58, 11 B₁ *prag eta mama nadistam kivi deve nādlunapi tat* is clumsy, in D its elegance is restored since *yat* takes the place of *tat* — 3 The singular *artate* and the inter

punctuation in t 118, 121 impair the meaning of the context and B₁, who erroneously joins *varānta* with *prāptakalāh*, this word is an adjective qualifying *darasamgrahah*. This is plain in D

vijñātaḥ śāharaḥ, putra, yurānaḥ bhāṭānaḥ yuram,

svādhinā rājānyau ca, mayā tu ca garentaḥ

varāntē, prāptakalāḥ tat kṛiyatam darasamgrahah —

4 The use of a dual of the neuter gender *paritrite*, t 123 185 B₁, to express the common predicate of the two subjects *puram Pātaliputram* and *Deçataḥ putra* is singular, and D's reading *paritritas tad agāhi* etc must be considered the right one Cp t 121, 218 — 5 The interpunction of t 105, 37, is edited in B₁, is proper to lead astray the reader *yathā yathā vicimāno, na tām prajā tathā tathā* I, at least, troubled myself to account for that partic of the present *vicimānaḥ* with the function of a verb finite, but afterwards, when I read the same passage over in the non interpuncted edition of D, it was immediately clear to me that B₁ ought to have interpuncted *yathā yathā vicimāno na tām prajā, tathā tathā / teṣu teṣu pradeçeṣu* so 'bhīamat Verily, it is better to edit Sanskrit texts with nāgarī types and little interpunction than in transcription and with Occidental fulness of stops semi-colons, signs of exclamation and interrogation etc These signs are better dispensed with

§ 5

Durgaprasād and his collaborator were better Sanskritists than Brockhaus, they availed themselves of his *editio princeps* moreover, they had the good chance of having in their possession an excellent manuscript not known to their predecessor. So they could carry out an edition of the *Kāthasamīti-sāgara* in many respects superior to that of the European scholar. I have stated above that nevertheless their work cannot be called a critical edition nor has it the pretension of making this claim. Inaccuracies and bad readings are not wanting in this better text too. Now and then, B₁'s text is even preferable. This is chiefly the consequence of typographical errors and misprintings, easily recognizable as such and less adapted to misleading than the errors and mistakes of Br. Another drawback for Hindoo editors is the right division of the words according to the standard of European and American use, something unfamiliar to minds accustomed to the *scriptio continua*. Errors in this respect are not wanting neither, but they are easy to be detected. The first edition of D contained a *śuddhapatram*

with a great number of corrections, yet not complete, this list is not added to the 2^d edition — my copy is from 1903 — but the editors have, of course, corrected their text accordingly. The accuracy in revising it was, however, not so great as to forbid new typographical errors to make their appearance e.g. 42, 172 *jagama* D¹ and Br, *jagada* (quite nonsensically) D², — 45, 398 *na ca tasyecchu vitatha* D¹ and Br, *na ca tasyecchamī tatha* (sic) D², — 54, 32 *udbhuta* D¹ and Br, *tadbhuta* D² — 64, 101 *panamatta* D¹ and Br *panavatta* (nonsense) D². Upon the whole the amount of such inaccuracies and misprints is not too great for a text edited in India by Indian scholars and such cases as 62, 72 *litvadha*, 71, 255 *vīṣayogurnavottirnan* instead of *litvadha* and *vīṣayogurnavottirnan*, where the oversight of the error of the typographer who put one wrong letter for the right one destroys the understanding of the whole sentence, are comparatively rare.¹⁾

Another face of the shortcomings of the learned pundits measured by the standard applied to Western scholarship, however laudable their work may be from a vernacular point of view shows itself in the following. The editors have taken Br's text for the base of their edition. This was the most natural course to be followed even if they had not explicitly named Br together with the two manuscripts as the three *paṣṭakam* which were the sources of their text, we would consider it a matter of course that they made the 'editio princeps' the groundwork of their own performance. I suppose, they will have marked their corrections and modifications in some copy of Br. Yet in doing this useful work they could have been a little more careful. Now and then it is likely some faults of Br have passed over in their edition, by want of accuracy, not because the same faults are in their manuscripts. In the beginning of t. 71 Vṛṣṇakidatta rescues a Cāṭra king from drowning in the river. The grateful prince offers him his friendship and assistance, and invites him as his guest

taṁ prasadam kuruṣvati grhaṁ bhṛtyasya te prabho

"So do me the favour, my lord of coming to my palace, since I am your slave" (P. II, 154). It is clear, that *bhṛtyasya te* must be read. Both editions, however, have *bhṛtyasya me*. The mistake of Br remained unchanged by inadvertence of D. Other instances are 21, 96 Br and D *bleje 'param cṛyam*, though it is evident that *bleje param cṛyam* is meant, 73, 396 *baddhi* Br and D

¹⁾ Cp. also 105 b D *para lōcayha* a no classical reading for *'grāha* Tar 34, 20. Br *ta* is doubtless preferable to D *sa*.

for *vadhva* cp 'T II 212, with his wife', 25, 216 *tasmanñi* for *tasymñi*, 63, 175 foll *pralīta* for *prakīta*. In this respect, the 2^d edition is somewhat better. 31, 1 D¹ with B has the ungrammatical participle *kuranti*, D² *kurati*. 18 5 D¹ with B the barbarism *bhūdanti*, D² *bhūdanti*.

It would be useless to deal longer or fuller with this subject. Even if I succeeded in drawing a complete list of all those cases where D's readings are inferior to those of Br, the profit would be small. Taking all in all, D is the standard edition nowadays and ought to keep this worth up to that future time, when the text of the Kathāsaritsāgara, critically revised in the strict sense of the word, and with help of all manuscripts available duly selected and classified, will lay before us.

CHAPTER II.

LIST OF PASSAGES, THE TEXT OF WHICH HAS BEEN IMPROVED IN D

After expounding in the preceding chapter the progress obtained for the understanding of our text by the edition of D, we will now proceed to make up a list of the more important cases of improved readings, not yet mentioned in the foregoing. Sometimes the meaning of the text is greatly modified by them, sometimes the bearing of the change is less, but I have avoided from noticing such corrections — and they, too, are numerous — as are of no consequence for the understanding

- 1, 42 D *lacca tatsamecayayana* with a meaning more appropriate than that of the text of Br, also the metre is improved Cp T I, 3 n
- 61 D *mokṣate*, the 3^d person is indispensable, as Çaivānī does not address Māhvant Bī *mokṣase* will not do here
- 5, 11 D *pañcabhūṃ mīlitaḥ kim yaḥ jagatīha na sādhyate*, doubtless right, *Im na* being, as usual, = *saṃam api*, Bī *kīyat*
- 133 D *śākaśam* 'cater of vegetables', instead of Br *śālāśanam*, unmeaning T already detected the fault, cp his translation I, 31, n 2
- 6, 20 D *ganūcātaro jāto 'yam Gunūdhyaḥ*, where Bī *gunūcātaro* etc, hence T translates „this child is an incarnation of virtue“, what ought to be, an incarnation of one of his Gūṇas” Another instance of confounding *guṇa* and *gūṇa* is at 15, 368 In D the similar mistake has been made 114, 70, Bī has here the right reading
- 32 In the pleasant story of the merchant Musaka it is related that he was born after his father's death and that this mother, having lost her property by the wickedness of his relations, educated him in poverty From lack of

money to pay a teacher, she persuades some teacher to give him some instruction by way of charity. Here B's reading (which has also passed into Lammann's *Reader* p 40) *upādhyāyam athābhyaithya tayā kīmcana dīnayā* is not satisfactory, what may here be the use of *kīmcana*? The good reading is of course (D) *tayā kīmcanya-dīnayā*, 'she, deserving compassion because of her poverty (*ākīmcanya*)'

86 Instead of B *ity evam uddeṣe*, which T could not render properly, D has *ity evam taddeṣe*

150 T translates well „and the king for his part was comforted”, but this is not expressed by B's *śastah*, but by the text as constituted in D *vājāpy ubhayaśah siddhim matvāṣvasto bahhūna sah*

In other passages, too, B has failed with respect to the verb *śas*: 25, 201 D and T *saṁāśrasya* (B *saṁāśrasya*), 33, 173 D *viśrāsya* (B wrongly *viśrasya*), 106, 100 D and T *kiṭāṣvāsū* (B *kiṭā 'āṣā*)

7, 5 Ciryavaiman narrates to his king his journey to Kauttikey's shrine in order to obtain the help of that god to fulfil his extraordinary promise. When, *being near his aim*, he fell senseless on the ground, exhausted by austerities and fatigue, some affable man, so he said, had comforted him and taken away his hunger and thirst. The words I have put in italics are so corrupt in the original text of B, that T could not find out their meaning. D gives them in their genuine shape, editing *tato 'dhoanī manakeṣe jāle* 'when there was (still) little remaining of the way'

79 It must not be read with B *putro me pravitah kṛpā* (T „my son has been sent away somewhere”) but with D *pravitah* 'my son is abroad somewhere'

81 D *saṁutsarīya* preferable to B *saṁutpatya*

10, 12 Cū gratifies her worshipper Kalanemi with the promise that he shall become wealthy and obtain a son who shall rule a kingdom, yet himself shall be put to death in an ignominious manner, „because thou hast offered flesh in the fire with impure motives”. T has translated so from B *hutam agnau tayā yasmād amīcam kalasātmanā*. The offering of flesh looks somewhat strange in this place, as the preceding ślokas mention only libations (*homās*) offered to the goddess of Fortune. The right reading is

found in D *yasmād amariṣa kaluṣatmanā* 'because thou hast offered libations with a mind troubled by anger'

- 47 D *ṃgaya* suits better the structure of the period than Br *ṃtya ca*

- 11, 6 B's reading *cha Vasavadattakhyā kanyā kamayate param* ('the maiden named V alone has a liking for me') purports an impossibility. At this point of the tale Udāyana, who speaks these words, either did not know Vāsavadattā at all or only by name. Moreover, the tale itself makes her fall in love with U a long time there after and in consequence of a contrivance of U. The right reading is in D *cha Vasavadattakhyā kanyā kaṣṭayate param* etc. = there is but one maiden they say (that suits me as a wife)

- 52 What may be the meaning of the last word of the line *sa tam praty abravīd eam manmathajñanuvandinī* (Br)? Since there must be expressed by that phrase that Angirarati spoke so moved by love towards Candamahāsenā D's reading *manmathajñanuvartinī* is of course, to be adopted

- 12, 49 ff. Yugandhruvāna associates himself with the brahmarīkṣas Yogeśvara who chose him as his friend, as is rightly said in D *mihablataya utāvan abhyetya*, whereas B confounding the akṣaras *dī* and *i* — see *supra*, p. 70 — has *dhitāvan upetya*. Thanks to a charm taught to him by that friend, Y altered his shape changing himself into a deformed hunchbacked old man with the appearance of a madman, *umattarēṣah* in B must be of course 'equal'), the words that follow 'in Br *khalv attakusyasamjananā* (çl 51) cannot be genuine, for *attakūśya* does not simply mean laughter and is wholly out of place here. From D it appears that he was bald, too, *khalvato kusyasamjananah*. In çl 52 D has *śvanaddhaprthūlavatī* for B's *śvanaddham pr*^o

- 64 D *śivanantrīṃyogitā rajñe smai sa samarpayat* B has here *śyocitā* (typographical error?) and *śvai samam arpayat*

- 14, 16 In the tale of the clever deformed child this boy says to his father 'Papa, I have two pupils' So the boy said every day, and his father suspecting that his wife

had a punnour, would not even touch her" This the child spoke „with suppressed voice", as Tawney translates Br's *ardhaviṣṭayā girā*, = 'mit leiser Stimme' in his German translation This 'suppressed voice, though not contrary to the situation, can never be meant by the quoted words of the text, *ardhaviṣṭa* signifies 'occupied —, possessed for the half' D has the appropriate expression *avispaṣṭayā girā*, 'with his articulate voice', as he was a little child

i, 57 D *bhāveṃa vyabhicārinah*, preferable to Br *bhāvet sū vyabhicārin*

i, 46 D *avasaram daduh* more in conformity with the idiom than Br *daduh*

91 According to Br, Vāśvadattī accompanied the army incognito „ascending a comfortable carriage sent by Padmāvatī, with its great horses also put at her disposal by her (P)" As she is said to have got a carriage, it was not necessary to add that she obtained it with its horses Somadeva, indeed, does not narrate so instead of *tanmahaturagah* (Br) we find in D *tanmahattarakah*, attendants of rank and high personages were put at her disposal; besides the carriage

121 When the celestial voice has testified with ringing sound to the innocence of Vāśvadattī, all bystanders are astonished and rejoiced like peacocks hearing the pleasant sound of thunder In this likeness the epithet *udyatharah* 'with uplifted hands' of Br is less appropriate than D's reading *utkandharac ca sacrom* etc., for uplifting the neck towards the celestial apparition does apply as well to the king's attendance as to the peacocks

7, 19 In the myth of Puruṣas and Urvāṣi it is told how Indra after vanquishing the demons made a great feast This *utsavah* is characterized in Br by the epithet *prairittasāraṇadhusarthaḥ* (P „a feast, at which all the nymphs of the heaven displayed their skill", Geldner *Fed Studien* I, 257 „ein Fest, an welchem die Himmelsmädchen theilnahmen") Better D *prairitta* 'where the Ap-sarasas executed their dances' Cp *supra*, p 70

32 King Udayana by his narration of the adventures of Urvāṣi had abashed a little his wife Vāśvadattī suspecting a disguised reproval of her own conduct Yaugin-dharāyanti, in order to dispel that thought from her

mind and to appease her, begins to narrate some other story about a wife who loved her husband most sincerely. This is said in clear and plain words in D

tām dṛṣṭvā yuktīyopālambhām rājñā deṣam ulakṣitam

athāpyāyayitum bhūpam āha Yaṅgandharāyaṇak ||

Br has here *tathā 'apy āpayitum*, which cannot mean 'to make him feel in his turn' [T] („um ihn auch etwas empfinden zu lassen" Brockhaus' own transl) and is obviously non-sensical

73 foll

The merchant Dharmagupta, knowing that his daughter Somaprabhā must not be given in marriage, concealed her, yet a young merchant, Guhacandra beheld her on the occasion of the spring festival and no sooner had he got sight of her, than *sa manobhāṣābhallyeṣa sadyo hrdayalagnayā / tayā mumuccheṣa* (Br), which in T's translation is rendered „she clung like a creeper of love round his heart, so that he was, as it were, faint" 'This singular image we happily get rid of, finding in D's text that he fainted because his heart was hit, as it were, *manobhāṣābhallyeṣa*, that is 'by Amor's arrow'

The enamoured youth having informed his parents of his love by the mouth of a friend, his father Guhasenā went to Dharmagupta to ask his daughter in marriage for his son. This demand is followed by a refusal, but the pretext of madness of the girl, which Dh gives in Br's text, cf 76, *kanya 'arthato me mudhā 'iti* (I 'the fact is, my daughter is out of her mind') is not sufficiently in accordance with the rest of the tale. In D the father answers *kanya kuto me mudheta* [= *mudhā + iti*] „I have no daughter at all fool!" In fact, Dh, after the birth of that extraordinary and heavenly being, had given out abroad that she was dead (*mṛteta khyāyitam bahih* cf 70)

128

Afterwards, Somaprabhā having become Guhacandra's wife on condition that she never should share his bed, the husband endeavours to excite her love by degrees, in order that he may enjoy the pleasure of a conjugal life. He feigns to prepare himself to call upon a certain hetaira and so rouses her jealousy. Looking at him askance with wrinkled brows she says

hum jñātam etadartho 'yaṁ tesaḥ, tatra ca mā sma gāh'

kim tayā? mām upēhi tuam, aham hi tava gēhām

According to Br, she speaks these words *vidāyāramena kareṇa*, a phrase I cannot understand its translation ('zog ihn in der linken Hand hebe', 'lifting up her veil with her left hand') is effected by hermeneutical *tour de force*. D restores the genuine text reading *nirūyā* etc 'returning him with her left hand'

- 133 A small mistake disfigures the *morale de la fable* as exposed by the great Yaṅgundhrayana. Instead of *yoga*° there is to be read with D *yagapradanadisukṛtāḥ śubhākarmaṇam tisthanti gṛhṇipade*. There is here no room for *yoga*, but the good works, the reward of which are such excellent heavenly wives, consist of *sacrifices* acts of charity and the like.

18, 24 In B₁ the splendid beauty of the royal palace is compared to that of the sea at moonrise or of a lotuspond *pravate* ('in windy weather' T). D has *mabhate* 'it driesbreak', and this Somadeva surely must have meant

46 foll In the description of the golden throne dug up for Udayana by the peasants which is a foretoken of his future domination, there are three errors in B₁, one of which has been corrected by T (*darśayat* for °*yan*), another by Boehtlingk (*matī* for *satī* see Petr Diet VII, 569 s v *satī*). Both corrections make part of D's text moreover the first compound is there *arunama nigravakṣanaprasaṅgaḥ*, B₁° *grama*°

53 King Udayana exhorted by his first minister to seat himself on the golden throne, with these words *etat kulakramayatam mahasimhananam tayaśyat praptāḥ tat samantūya devāṇāmkriyatam itī* declines on account that such a high place behoves only one who has performed the *dṛṣṭvaya*. The king's answer is made up of the 51 53 and 54. Yet the former of them has such a shape in Br, that the translator must add the former line to Yaṅgundhrayana's speech and assign only the second part of the śloka to the king. Br reads

*vijitya pṛthivīm arudha yatra te prapitamahā
tatra jite dīśah sariśh kumam arolataḥ pratlāḥ*

In D however, the śloka has this fashion

*vijitya pṛthivīm arudha yatra me prapitamahā
tatra jite dīśah sariśh ka mam arolataḥ pratlā*

= That throne which my ancestors mounted after conquering the earth, how can I gain glory by ascending

it before conquering all the regions² etc 'Thus speaking (*ity ācūān narapatiṛ*) and so on''

- 88 Āditya-enṛ mounts on horseback, his horse is an excellent runner „that in spirit and fury resembled a torrent”¹⁾, as T translates (Br) *īarūṣam darpodghatanamṛjharām* 'This somewhat surprising image, where also *udghatana* itself is employed in a strange manner, to say nothing more, disappears in D. The horse is simply described there as *darpoḍyadgharmanṛjharām*²⁾, that is literally „sweating [*gharmanṛjara* = *sveda*] from (ardour and) pride'

- 136 'This śloka is a variation on the *सख अयं सः सखः सखः सखः* Br's text disagrees here in two points with D, it has in pāda b *buddhi*, but D *irddhi*, and in pāda d two words *ībhinnam bahunṛyakam* that make up a compound in D. The reading of the latter is

īyam hi dauṛyattukairddhi sthānam anṛyakam
na tu īplutasanīrtham ībhinnabāhunṛyakam

„better, indeed, is a state without a ruler so that their prosperity merely depends on fate, than one with many discordant rulers, which entails the scattering of all their wealth” Surely, this is a sentence more suitable to the situation

- 145 Viḍuṣaka has obtained the promise of the brahmins, his cohabitants, that they should recognise him as their chief and lord after he would have well performed a certain difficult enterprise 'If you do this', so they speak in T's translation, 'you shall be our lord, we make this agreement' This translation expresses their declaration otherwise than the text, which it is supposed to render 'They did not say, we make this agreement' but „we consider ourselves bound by this word, *etam hrte tām anukam sūmi nyama eva nah* (cl 141) By itself the difference is extremely slight, but it seemed worth noticing to me because in the next śloka a word for 'agreement' being wanted, Br has *nyama* that may be = 'obligation, bond' but can never mean 'agreement' commonly expressed by *saṁaya*. The whole śloka in Br runs as follows

ity eva khyāpya nyamam praplayām rajanau ca tan
āmanṛya īpṛau prapayau śmaṇam sa Viḍuṣakah

¹⁾ T 1, 1.3 adds this note 'More literally, a torrent of pride and kicking'

²⁾ In D' *īarūṣam*, a hypothetical error

In it, besides *nyamam*, the absolute *kyappa* is grammatically incorrect. D again removes the difficulties, reading *ityevā khyappa samayam* etc. cp 142 *samaye ca rayam sthātā* and 139 *samayam iva dadumy aśan*.

- 267 Princess Dukkharabdhikā had been given in marriage to the king of Kācchapa, but as the husband entered at night the private apartments of his newly married wife he died immediately. The same disaster occurred anew at her second wedlock and when through fear of the same fate other kings did not wish to marry her, the king gave this order to his general — You must bring a man in turn from every single house in the country so that one shall be supplied every day, and he must be a Brahman or a Kshatriya. And after you have brought the man you must cause him to enter by night into the apartment of my daughter let us see how many will perish in this way, and how long it will go on. Whoever escapes shall afterwards become her husband. The last sentence is F's (I, 138) translation of cl 267, as edited in B.

yaś tanyati paścac ca so 'sya bhartu bhaviyati
here *paścac* (afterwards) is superfluous with the future *bhaviyati*. In D the line reads much better thus

ut tanyati yaś suta so sya bhartu bhaviyati
'who survives in this (trial) shall become her husband'

- 280 Vidusikā offers himself to that dangerous adventure. While he was staying in the apartment of the princess he saw the Rikṣas that caused the death of the former bridegrooms who had perished there opening the door and stretching his hand through the entrance into the room. So according to D *aparitakapitakam ayantan aṅśata*. The reading of B *aparitakapitakam* is evidently a corruption thereof.

- 371 Br *lastagatā snehat* I (I 143) renders this thus to him who though affliction had endured the utmost hesitating as it were, between accepting *kastī*° or *leśthā*° as the necessary correction of the unmeaning *kastī*°. From D it appears that the genuine reading is *kastīṇa gatasnehat* a compound regarding not the love of Vidusikā but of Bhudra. At hearing this, her affection came to its highest pitch. Cp Kumārasambhava 3, 35

has *dattasammadah* 'much rejoiced', a better reading than that mentioned by T, °*sambhava* At 104, 51 Br has the same fault, here, too, D and two of T's MSS read °*sammadah* As to *sammada*, cp 26, 287 46, 366

- 70 This śloka describes the impression made on the mind of the spectators by the march of the victorious army of Udayana by means of the simile that the clouds of dust rained by it concealed the brightness of the sun 'This is rightly said in D *itua taccamurenur arkatejas tirodadhe* Br's text *itua tac ca bhurenuk* etc (sic) is unmeaning

- 96 *na parai Muralanum sa seke mudhasu nonnatim*
larair ahanyamunesu yavat kuntakucceṣv api

So D In Br *kunta* being severed from *kucceṣu* is considered a word by itself, which caused T to misunderstand the meaning of the whole phrase ¹⁾ There is no mention at all of tributes (*lara*) or other exaction by which the Muralis, were completely beaten down", but of their womankind 'Not only' says the poet, 'he did not allow the Muralis to keep their heads high he abated also the elevation of their women's breasts beaten down by their own hands (in mourning over their killed relatives)'

- 107 When Udayana set out to conquer the Northern region, he marched says Somadeva to the quarter made lovely by the smile of Kubera *Kailasahasubhagam acam abhisasara sah* In Br's text this line is preceded by the words *Kuberatilakam ilakam angacamsinim* manifestly epithets of the Northern quarter Yet *Alaka* is Kubera's city, it is not synonymous with Kubera's quarter, and how to explain *angacamsinim*? D substituting one aksara (*sa* for *ma*) dispels this perplexity It has *tatah Kuberatilakam Alakasangaçamsinim* etc

- 20, 137 The terrible aspect of the witch *Kulavati* is qualified by several epithets among them *nayanananantolka* From D we learn that it should be °*antolka* 'casting forth flames out of her eyes and mouth'

- 219 Yaugandharayana applying to king Brahmadatta the story he has told says to Udayana

tasmat tava sa rajendra jivopy acaratah śubham

Brahmadatto vikṛita yadi, hanyas tva m eia tavi

So D The apodosis in Br is *hanyeta sa 'eia tat* (sic)

¹⁾ Brockhaus himself tacitly omitted the difficult line in his translation

- 21, 60 The merchant Vasudatta bestowed so much wealth on his son-in-law, a king's son, that his pride on account of his father's splendour vanished. This is the meaning of the śloka as found in D, whose second line is

agalaḥ bahumāno 'sya yathā śaṣṭīśābhare,
evidently preferable to B *acalaḥ* etc

- 140 „Nārada said that you should obtain a son by propitiating Īśā” (T I, 172) This is the purport of the line in B

Gurūārādhanam prāpyaputram te Nārado 'bhyadhāt
Here the reader tacitly corrects *Gurūārādhanaḥprāpyam putram*, and this is found indeed in D

- 22, 39 Jimūtavāhana, having got the permission of his father Jimutaketu, besought his wishing-tree to display its wonderful power only to the benefit of others, in order that poverty should cease to be in the world. Accordingly „the wishing-tree showered much gold on the earth, and all the people rejoiced (T)”. The glory of that fact and the attachment of the people to Jimūtavāhana and his father filled the kinsmen of that prince with envy and hatred. They became hostile to Jimutaketu, „they thought it would be easy to conquer that place, which possessed the excellent wishing-tree that was employed for bestowing gifts, on account of its not being strong (T)”. If I rightly understand, the last clause must mean that they held the seat of the royal power for having lost its strength, since the wishing tree instead of serving as an instrument for upholding the reigning dynasty had been assigned to different aims. But if Somadeva intended to say so, why should he not state it explicitly? He is not accustomed to an obscure style. The fact is that B's text, which T had to follow, has here a reading hard to explain for what may be the meaning of *yuktāśpadam* in *dāno-payuktasatkalpaḥśayuktāśpadam*? D has *mukta* instead of *yukta*. So the purport of the whole śloka

dānopayuktasatkalpaḥśayuktāśpadam ca tat

memre mīprabhāratīy jetum sukaram eva ca

becomes plain. ‘They thought it would be easy to conquer that (kingdom, *rājyam* in śl 37), as it had lost its strength on account of the change of place of the excellent wishing-tree now employed to bestowing gifts’. In śl 34 it has been narrated that the wishing-tree, at Jimutav's request,

'he divided the begged food, three handfuls of rice, into three parts just as he broke asunder the truth'
Cl 102 has in D this shape

*punal sa saripapuni nyuni ganthyann na
japann avaratayamasa ciram mityakṣamulāṃ*

And 104 c D has *sa tatīcājayamasa* (Bī *sarīatru*°)

25, 13 D has *tasmin suṇadi līta* (not *tasmat*, as Br) a manifest correction

140 Line b of this *śloka* is not only defective in Br, but is also deprived by a false reading which obscures the meaning 'As translation (I, 211) like the night adorned with the rays of the moon, now that the moon itself had set, its splendour having waned in the dark fortnight, come to worship the funeral pyre, rests on Br's *citurcaya*. In D all is plain, for instead of *citurcaya* ('to worship the funeral pyre') it has *citarohaya* 'The wife who sits down on the couch near her empyred husband is duly compared to a night of the dark half of the month, at the time when the moon has set both in fact, are preparing to ascend the pyre that is to consume their husband the woman after the death of the tortured man and Night in the glow of the approaching dawn

*kṣapapakṣaparikṣine gate stam rajampatan
citarohaya tadācūratrayaṃ ratnam ugatam*

169 I let him therefore' says the queen in I's translation (I 213) be united to him as a spring creeper to its stall. The image is bad and contrary to the use of Indian rhetoric that always compares the union of husband and wife to the creeper clinging to a tree. In fact D has here as must be expected *vrkṣenevartanī tatī*, not *vinīten*°, as in Br.

183 D *vilīnāno malamamsam grīyatam itī ghorīyan* evidently the right reading, Br has *vikrīnte* the present tense disturbs the structure of the phrase.

201 and 211 On both places the pronoun of the 2^d person has been ousted in Br by a false reading. D has in the former place *akāśanaya bhījas te*, while the personal pronoun is indispensable, whereas Bī° *bhījas tām* with an unnecessary demonstrative. In the latter one D reads *ekā lī anniparaspāṇḍīdīṭṭīyanayanam vāyā*.

238 The absolute locative, that describes the dreadfulness of

the evening-twilight, when the rākṣasas are roaming about, has in D this shape different from B:

sphuraddipāralidantamūlabhāsvaṛabhūṣane

grmbhamāne mahāraudre nṛṣṇānaktamecarimukhe

Br, reading in pīda a *avalidha* etc failed to realize that here is meant the tooth like row of flame lines which diffuses some light in the fearful time of the commencing night — By the same oversight Br perverted 26, 142 *avalidantamūlam* (rdj bṛhuṣr) into *avalidhatamūlam* Çaktideva is taken off to the temple of Cundikā to whom he is destined as a victim. Somadeva draws some outlines of the figure of that blood thirsting goddess „Her belly was enlarged as if it continually swallowed many lives”, her face is compared to that of Death, but not of Death, devouring *tamūla* with projecting teeth”, as must be inferred from Br's text, but „whose rows of teeth are adorned with bells”, for so it is in D *khacadghantavalidantamūlam* etc

26, 20 Br does injustice to Çaktideva, making him seize the branch of the fig tree in his terror. On the contrary, the hero was fearless, *viśūdhīśaś*, as is edited in D instead of (Br) *'tha sudhīśat*

58 D calls the insolent girls who sprinkled the holy hermit with water *atimrbandhinīḥ*, a term more appropriate to the case, since they did so incessantly and with eagerness, than *atimrīartiniḥ* (Br), a strange and obscure expression in this place

96 The text of D takes away the difficulty of explaining *etaḍ* in *tair etannrpateḥ* it exhibits pīda *a* in this way *tair turnam nrpater agram* doubtless the true reading

114 The confusion of *nriartate* and *niartate* in mss is common, cp my observation in *WZ*, XVI, 112. Here Br has *na nriartante* erroneously, D as it ought to be, *na niartante*. Agum tīr 14, 107 Br *niṛṣṇā* is inversely corrected in D into *nirṣṇā*, likewise S 1, 27 and 104, 150¹⁾

136 Br (= 138 D) Br's *tataḥ* disturbs the sense 'The sons of Śatyaśatṛ did not say, as I must interpret from the text of B „Brahman, you went with our father to search here and there for the Golden City etc', but this „At that time you went with our father to search

¹⁾ At the former place D has *niṛṣṇā* and at the latter *nirṣṇā*

for the Golden City, and now you come back alone,
how is this? In D *pāḍi b* is *ciniann itas tadda*

229 B₁ (= 231 D) The ascetic Jalapāḍi, having received from
Devadatta the embryo taken out of the womb of the
yākṣiṇi Vidyutprabhā, deceived his mate and consumed
the embryo alone, after sending Devadatta away under
some pretext, *tat paṭayitvāna garbhamamsam* the reading
of Br. P translates, 'the great ascetic divided the child's
flesh'. But it is obvious that D's reading *tat paṭayit
vāna garbhamamsam* is preferable. Jalapāḍi cooked the
fetus in the presence of Devadatta, then he caused him
to withdraw that he might enjoy the benefit of eating
that disjunct food alone and immediately.

233 B₁ (= 235 D) Devadatta lamenting over the foul trick of
Jalapāḍi says among other things, 'to whom does not
excessive compliance entail misfortune?' The Sanskrit
original, here translated, is

yadi vatyantamīduta na kasya paribhūtaye?

To say nothing of the point, whether *mīduta* 'softness
mildness' may be the equivalent of 'compliance', the
reading of D

yadi vatyantam iḡuta na kasya paribhūtaye

is doubtless to be preferred. It is not 'excessive compliance'
but 'excessive uprightness' that makes an honest man the
dupe of scoundrels.

259 B₁ (= 261 D) In B₁ the simile has been made incomprehen-
sible by a bad reading *akṛṣṭaḥ satataḥ* cannot be right
even if *satataḥ* is considered to be erroneously put for *sa
tataḥ*. D has here

akṛṣṭaḥ sattvataḥ Siddheḥ leṣapuca vāyataḥ

The embryo drawn out by its neck is compared to the
long haul of fortune seized by the grasp of courage (*sattvataḥ*)

279 B₁ (= 281 D) After Çaktideva has become finally a vidyadhara
and has recovered his four wives in the Golden City
his father-in-law the king of the vidyadharas, bestows
on him his kingdom. And before abdicating the old king
performs also something else. What this is, is not plain
from the text of Br., where the second half of this minor
strophe has this shape

api ca kṛtinam evaṃ Çaktidevaṃ śānamna

vidyadhara samuditeṇa svecu vidyadhareṇa

T translates this and he gave the successful hero his

nāmē by which he was henceforth known among his Vidyādhīras. The fact seems as strange as the Sanskrit expression of it (*Çaktidevam śīanūmnā vyadhīta*). D's text makes the matter sufficiently clear

*api ca kṛtinam enam Çaktivegam śīanūmnā
vyadhīta samucitena śīeṣu vidyādhīreṣu,*

that is he (the old king) changed the name of his son-in-law a little by transforming (its latter part) *deva* into *vega*, a common name with his vidyādhīras. Names ending in *vega* are frequent among that lofty people. So Madanavega in tr 30 and foll., Mānasavega 34, 106 etc., Padmanavega 64, 62 (ib 58 B). *Padmanavega* by mistake, D has *Padmanavega*), another Madanavega 87, 7.

27, 146 In Amaragupta's praise of hunting as an appropriate and useful pastime of kings, T translates Br's text „hunting is approved to give them exercise and excitement, but unlike expeditions are not recommended” (I, 243). The strange second part of this sentence ought to be thus corrected „for kings who have not exercised themselves in the way of fighting are disapproved” according to D *yuddhādīhvānī na çasyante rājāno hy akītaçramāḥ*

185 Bī *paravat sadu*, D *paravatmanū*. For any one who reads the whole story of Karabhaka it must be plain that it is D that exhibits the good reading. The woman whom K has rescued so that she prefers him to her coward of a husband, prompts him to follow her but „by another way” than that taken by her husband and his company, of course. T (I, 245) has endeavoured to elicit some apposite meaning from Bī's *paravat sadu* („though I passed for some one unconnected with her”), but this translation not only omits *sadu*, but its content is less appropriate to the course of the tale.

196 Bī *tatrāstah sthitayoḥ nau ca, madhyahne tām tadava sāmītram me bhṛatrjyāyās tasyā veçam [= veçam] akārayat*. The beginning of this śloka is to be accepted, according to the interpunction, as an absolute locative, but what has the awkward mentioning of midday time in parenthesis to do here? *Madhyāhne* is corrupt. D reads *madhyāt etam tadava sāmī*. In fact not the absolute locative is here wanted, but *sthitayoḥ nau ca* are two genitives to be construed with *madhyāt* and either significative of two couples, „as the two women and we two [the two brahmins] stayed

there or the meaning is as we two also staved there
 28 65 The singular conduct of the yakṣiṃs the friends of
 the ṛṣṭras Rāmbhī who in order to benefit the king
 her lover, fill up his land with heaps of gold by trans-
 forming themselves into trees (I I 250), seems to be
 due to a misheard *uṣṭan* B took it for *uṣṭair* The
 yakṣiṃs poured down the gold as rain from heaven a
 well known Indian rhetorical image

29 62 In B this śloka is thus edited
ajayabhayanibhutam tam aṛṣṭa (sic) *Śayamprabhā*
Śayamprabhā takes her leave from Somprabhā This is
 however, impossible since it is she who had called upon
Śayamprabhā, with her friend Kalingasenā In fact it is
Kalingasenā, who takes leave as is plain from D
ajayabhayanibhutam tam aṛṣṭa Śayamprabhā
Kalingasenā aṛṣṭa yantī etc

I have connected the two parts of the bṛhuvīm which
 closes the first line in D they are by mistake separated
 (cp *supra* p 92) Cp also *supra* p 88

150 Kṛtisenā having overheard the conversation of the
 Rakṣasī and her children about King Viśudatta's disease
 and the means to cure it reflects that she may avail
 herself of that knowledge and save the life of that king
 who deserves it for he takes but small duties from
 the merchants In B this deliberation is made obscure
 by a fault in cl 150 *etam eva ita i so lpaṣṭkal prān*
tasthito vatah the acc has no verb to rely upon and
balī after *prantasthita* is a tautology Better D
etam eva ita i so lpaṣṭkal prantasthito vati
 = by the small duties he takes he is a bliss for this
 forest region

31 3 Kalingasena tells her friend Somprabhā that her father
 wishes to give her in marriage to Prasenjit who is an
 old man but Udayana so she says, the king of Vatsa
 is young and handsome you have told me, so first
 shew me Pras; and then take me there where the king
 of Vatsa is' (I I, 276) In the original text *kallāṛṇe*
 denotes the hermeneutical art Its rendering by in the
 course of conversation cannot be approved of D makes
 the śloka intelligible, which runs thus

I atseṣas tu yatha rupe dayana kallitas tattā
erutū upaprasidena Iṛta i tena yall i vial;

„but you have described the beauty of the king of Vatsa in such a way that —.”

- 27 and 29 D restores the true reading of two ślokas, which are obscure in B; B's text Citrālekṣhā has delivered to Anuruddha the love-message of Uṣā, and having excited thereby his eagerness to see Uṣā, she takes him up to her, „looking exactly as he had before appeared in Uśā's dream”, as T (I, 277) endeavoured to render B's text.

ādāya cātātadrūpam śāpnavatāre eva tam,
yet it is plain that neither of the two compounds *ātātadrūpam* and *śāpnavatāre* properly convey the meaning given to them in the translation D has *ādāya cātātadrūpasvapnavatāntam eva tam* = „took him, having made him know the story of her dream, just as it was” — Her joy when beholding him is thus described upad T 11 „When Uśā beheld that Anur arrived in bodily form, resembling the moon, there was a movement in her limbs resembling the tide of the sea”, a note at the bottom of the page informs the reader that *velāta* is evidently corrupt” So indeed it is. Instead of वेलाता D has वेलाता

The śloka is very plain in D, where it runs thus

*sā dr̥ṣṭvā Anuruddham tam Uṣā sakṣud upāgatam
amṛtāṃṣum nāmbodhivelā nāngeṣu aśatata*

= „when U beheld A arrived in bodily form, her limbs could not contain the emotion within her, as little as the seaside can do so under the influence of the moon”. Accordingly the hypothetical expedient of Böhtlingk (PW VI, 1375, s. v. *velā*) falls away. The expression *nāngeṣu aśatata* to signify an exuberant sudden joy is well-known. A variation of it occurs t 110, 112 *Kalūṅgasena tam dr̥ṣṭvā jāmūlaram aśatamajam / tralokyē 'pī na mātī sma sveṣu aṅgeṣu tu kā kathā* (cp also *supra*, p. 66)

- 35 D *ānayat param* better than B *ānayet param* T's translation 'might take up a strange man' is not wholly inconsistent, but the imperfect tense does better

- 32, 56 Br = 55 D is a general sentence, incorporated by Böhtlingk in his „Indische Sprüche”, who translates it thus „Wenn ein Weiser unter vielen Toren gerath, so ist er sicher verloren, wie eine Wasserschnecke, die auf den Pfad der Wellen gerath” This „Pfad der Wellen” answers to *pathas tarangāṇām* of the text of Br T, who rests on

the same text, has likewise „A single wise man fallen among many fools, like a lotus in the path of the waves, is sorely overwhelmed” But it is not in the habit of Sanskrit rhetoric to employ comparisons of such an and character, and further the plural *paṭhas* cannot be accounted for How much better the śloka appears in D

eko bahūnām murkhūnām madhye nīpatito budhah

padmah pāṭhas tarangūnām va vipālate dhruvam

So we get a well elaborated simile and, at the same time, a pun The one wise man fallen among many fools is like a lotus fallen on the waves Either of them *vipālate*, the wise man because he comes into distress, the lotus inasmuch as it floats about on the back of the waves *Pāṭhas* = ‘water’ is quoted in the Petr Dict from our author twice, 27, 122 and 73, 194, it is also met with 102, 54 and 103, 57

87 B₁ = 86 D is thus rendered „Whom will not a wicked woman kill, when won over by another man, like a sword in an enemy’s hand, since enticed by love she commits reckless crime without being taught” (P I, 255) The last three words look rather odd in this connection Yet T rendered faithfully B₁’s reading *açikṣitā*, D has *açankitā* „without any scruple’, doubtless right

35, 58 A misreading of what he found in his mss., is the cause, it seems of *kaṇṭhakaṇṭh* put by Brockhaus for *kaṇḍukaṇṭh* By the vicious reading the pun is lost D has
utpatadbhīḥ patadbhīḥ ca hanyamāṇaḥ śrapaṇina

caram mrgaiḥ ca śimhaiḥ ca kṛditaḥ kaṇḍukaḥ va
 The king killing in the sport of the chase antelopes and lions makes the impression as if he played with balls, *utpatati* denotes the ‘rising up’ of the wounded or hunted deer and at the same time the ‘jumping’ of the ball, both *patanti*, the animals, when hit and unable to arise from the ground, the balls, when coming down

37, 85 The elegance of the expression is enhanced, if we read with D *rāgīn śricittam etudrī*, where *rāgīn* is a vocative Br has *rāgishcittam*

38, 28 The ficticia Mādhavmīlā conjectures that the Rājput who visits her must be a person of high condition for the reason given in this śloka, which has in Br this form

sā tam kaṣṭhyāsa sākūta-nirīramita kayādīkam

śrutā parīyanūd, matvā pracchannam kameid uttamam,

I thought the adj *nirvanita* must convey this meaning, that the king in disguise by his appearance alone cured wounded horses and other animals. So he translated the śloka accordingly (I, 318), adding in a note a parallel taken from one of the romantic stories about Lancelot. Yet such cures are wholly out of place in our passage, which treats of the horses and elephants of a rich heterei in the style of Vāṃśiśena (Mecchakati cet IV) not of war-horses and of a king who never is represented as a possessor of supernatural power. I himself remarks that with this acception of the text, *sakuta* cannot be translated, but reading *sakutam* as he does with one MS, implies the necessity of construing that adverb with *çrūta*, something improbable on account of the distance which separates both words. Now it appears from D that B's *nirvanita* is nothing but a misread *nirvanita*.

sa tam lakṣyaṁ sakutanirvanitahayudikam etc

T's translation should, therefore be amended thus. She having heard from her attendants that as he passed through the zones he contemplated with interest the horses and other animals. Now it is indifferent whether we read *sakuta*° or *sakutam*.

103 (Br) *sa tasmā veda saṁkhyotā dadau svairāya pum bhujān* etc mean nothing else but she gave him the arms of golden men, which arms are counted (or enumerated) in the Veda (or Vedas). This purport does not at all suit the course of the tale. For this reason to get at least something intelligible out of it I translated the line quoted she gave him as many arms of the golden figures as he knew Vedas and this Somadeva has doubtless meant, cp vs* 118. Yet the proper explanation is found in D *veda saṁkhyākaṁ* — Some verses below (106) D has *arajarakṣite kṣemān nisinna me kincane bhārat*.

39 106 It is plain that (D) *saṅghatayati* is the true reading not (B) *saṅghatlayati*, the meaning being he assembles. And vs 118 (D) *kṣipraṁ* seems preferable to (B) *kṣemaṁ*.

10 21 Śakra admonishes a brahman who thinks he may acquire wisdom without learning and study by mere *tapas* that he is wrong striving after something impossible. Such a wish says he is like longing for writing without letters pointing in the air or horns of a hare. Br is here totally corrupt the first pāda *et jant carati me t*

defies interpretation, cp T's note on I 370 Every difficulty disappears in D, which has

*iyam śaṣaṁsan eccha iṣomni vā citraśālpanā
anahśaro lipinyaso yad vidyādhyayanam vira*

This śloka is found with the self-same words in Kṣemendra's Bīhaṭkathāmañjarī, XIV, 342 (p 196 of the printed edition) For the rest cp Bhūtrbhāṇi Nītiṣ stanza 4

- 34 The words with which Marubhūti, that drunk and quarrelsome fellow, addresses Gomukha convey a convenient meaning in D, which in B₁ has been lost owing to bad readings T (I, 371) translates „There is power in the speech of G, but there is no might in the arms of men like you A garrulous, quarrelsome, effeminate person makes heroes blush” This is a good rendering of B₁

*balam Gomukha vācy eva, na tu bāhvor bhavadūṣām,
vācālah kalahā klibas trapākṛd bāhuṣālīnām,*

but it has a strange purport A miles gloriosus, like Marubhūti, never would avow that a garrulous poltroon, as he takes Gomukha, should make him blush! In D the pīḍa c is *vācālah kalahā klibas* Adopting this reading and dissolving Br's compound *Gomukhavacy* into two separate words we get the genuine form of our śloka

*balam Gomukha vacy eva na tu bāhvor bhavadūṣām
vācālah kalahā klibas trapākṛd bahuṣālīnām*

„Men like you, G, have only strength in their tongue, not in their arms It is blameful for heroes to quarrel with effeminate braggarts”

33 54

The physician to whom the old king Vilasīśī applies to make him young again is a cunning fellow he promises to fulfil his wish, but only under this condition that the king shall remain for eight months in an underground room alone The ministers, who do not trust the matter, dissuade the king In days of old, they say, there existed herbs etc which had the power of rejuvenating, but nowadays such a thing is impossible’ The argument with which they assert that opinion is vitiated in Br by several corruptions D restores its true form, as follows

*adyatve ca śrutany eva rasāny etan bhīpate
sūmagryabhaiṇ kṛtanti yat pratyuta uparyayam 53
tan na yuktaṁ idam, dhurtak kṛdanti eva hi bahiṣaṁ
kim deṣa sanatīkrāntam agacchati punar iayah 54*

„But in the present time, O king, these elvirs¹⁾ are only heard of [= they do not exist in reality], and owing to the want of proper materials, produce the opposite effect to that which is intended *For this reason, it is not fit [to do] so [as the physician advises]*, for rogues do in this way make sport with fools, etc. I have italicized the phrases, which correct T's translation, the rest is given with his own words

- 81 The cunning physician having succeeded in persuading the king to shut up himself in a subterranean abode, made king in his place a young man, named Ajara. But king Ajara shows little gratefulness to the physician, though he honours him and avoids to take his advice about state affairs. The physician in his uneasiness once reminds Ajara that it was he who made him king, whereupon the other answers, 'you are wrong it is not you but my *praktanam karṇa* that gave me this royal power'. At these words the physician is perplexed and reflects in this manner as I literally quote from T's translation (I 374) This man is not to be intimidated and speaks like a resolute sage. It is better to overawe that master *the secret of whose character is instability*, but that cannot be done with this man so I must submit to him." I do not understand the purport of the words I have italicized which seem to be the endeavour to a faithful translation of Br's *yad rahasyam tarangatām*, a clause rather unmeaning in my opinion. Here too D removes the difficulty. The śloka is edited there in this shape

*yad rahasyaantarangatām si musamananam param
tad api kṣamate na smim amityaś tad eva me*

Its purport is quite different. Even the most excellent means to gain one's master's favour the possessing a secret in common is useless with this man so I must submit to him."

- 42, 166 D *tad gṛhaṁ tām eva tatkaladgam nistṛiṇṇakārinikam
atyaktajātūlarmam man etenava nyataya*
(cp T I, 357, 2) so take you his sword etc", manifestly a correction of Br's text, where *nistṛi ṇakārinikam* is quite unmeaning

¹⁾ Perhaps we should correct *raṣṣā* (= *raṣa*) T's MS has *ar* (see his note at I 372)

- 43, 248 This gīti stanza in Br is troublesome, the words
vibhūṣitam sudaṣārīhakūlena jaladhīm cannot be understood
 'I was at a loss how to translate them, see his note on
 I, 402 All becomes plain in D

*sarīe ca <te> vibhūṣitaSudaṣārīhakūlena jaladhīm ākramya
 samupāhṛitām svapatnīṃ vyaktam sodaryamūrtim amṛtasya
 ajarūṅganāṣṭatayutam āyatām śrīyam vābhyānandans tām,*
 = „and they all welcomed her (viz Karpurikā) arrived
 with her husband (Naiavāhṛadatta), the ornament of
 the illustrious family of the Daṣārīhas, who had brought
 her over sea, as a manifestation of the very sister
 of the *amṛta*, yea as if she were Śrī accompanied
 with a hundred of ever young nymphs” The right
 acceptation of the epithet *vibhūṣita*^o is secured by the
 comparison of 107, 46, cp PWK VII, 147 s. v
sudaṣārīhakula Though Naiavāhṛadatta is a descen-
 dant of Arjuna, not of Kṛṣṇa — see our author 9,
 6 — he is reckoned to belong to the family of the
 Daṣārīhas

- 259 Bī *vinīta-gaganāṅgatāgamana-khedah* is rendered by T
 (I, 403) „Naiavāhṛadatta], having made his party of
 anti-travellers forget the fatigues of the journey” The
 inelegant agglutination *āṅgatāgamana* disappears in D,
 where the compound has this shape *vinītagagananāṅganā
 gamanakhedah* As to *gagananāṅga* = the wide firmament
 the sky' cp Aptis Dictionary s. v. *anāṅga*

- 261 Instead of Bī *bhuktvā 'uttaram* which is no Sanskrit
 at all, to convey the meaning required here immediately
 after (he) had taken food (T I, 403), D has *bhukto
 ttaram*, as usual Cp 14, 107 73 15 114 51 121,
 2 123, 52 It is only in the last three places that Br
 has edited the word as it ought to be 11, 107 we
 find again *bhuktvā 'uttaram* and 73, 15 even *bhuktetaram*
 Cp also Kṣemendra (p 329) IX, 2, 519 (p 512)
 XVI, 17

- 11, 65 *etat kṛtvā* (Bī) is a mere slip of the pen, it seems,
 for *etac chrutvā* (D), which is required

- 108 Prabhāsa relates to his master his conversation with
 the king of Śrīkānta In Br his relation begins with
 this half-śloka

deva Śrīkāntaḥśāye prabham samgatam alam
 where the acc *prabham* is a syntactical mon-stum, the

instrument being wanted. It is plain that D's text, where that line runs thus

deva Āṛikantharīsaye prabhī aman gataṁ āham,
has the right reading, and it is highly probable that Brockhaus has misunderstood his ms., *prabhum sangata°* and *prabhraman gata°* may be very like to each other in the ms. he had at his disposal. T's translation (I, 410) must accordingly be thus modified „King, in the course of my wandering I arrived in the country of Āṛikantha”

- 133 When king Janamejaya of Kauṣāmbī performs the marriage ceremony of his daughter with prince Sūryaprabha, Br's text contains the memorable fact that „he made such a feast, that even the realm of Pluto was exclusively engaged in music and dancing” (T I, 411)

cakre ca lūḍya-nṛttaika-yama-lokam mahotsavam
What, may be asked, had king Yama to meddle there-with? Nothing at all, indeed. In D he disappears with his realm, it is there simply said, that „he made a great festival to his guests, which entirely consisted of music and dancing” = *cakre ca ludyannṛttaikamayam lokam mahotsavam*

- 176 D = 177 Br has *loshtham* instead of *loṭṭam* (D). The same error (in Br) and correction (of D) 49, 68

- 186 D = 187 Br is thus translated by T (I, 414) „Then Śākala, inhabited by that fortunate one, appeared glorious, as if the chiefs of the gods, of the followers of Kuvera, and of the snakes had made in it many deposits of much wealth” If, however, we read with D in pāda c *suva-Dhanada-bhujaga-nagarath* (instead of *°bhujanga varath*), this *āryā* stanza will contain a more convenient meaning „appeared, by its great wealth and heavy treasures, as if it were made up of the cities of the Gods, of Kubera, and of the Snakes, put together” In pāda b (D) *bhoginī* is preferable to (Br) *bhāginī*

- 15, 183 Prince Sun-hine (Sūryaprabha) is described lying alone, without any of his many wives, on his couch sleepless. The reason of his sleeplessness, says the poet, was that Sleep (*Nidrā*) herself was angry at him „saying to herself, ‘what is the use of this unloving man, who leaves his wives outside?’” (T I, 123) The original in Br is
„*mānchena kum etena śva-priyās tyajatā lakṣh*”

iti va nidrā stri nityasya cakāśasya asya na āyayan
 Here the compound *nidrā-stri* is suspicious, I translates it 'the goddess of sleep' but *nidra*, being a feminine noun does not want the addition of *stri* for the sake of personification and *nityasya* in connection with the words following must imply the meaning that Surya prabha slept alone habitually yet he did so that night exceptionally. Much better is the reading of the second line in D

itva nidra stinityasya itasyāpy asya nayayan
 with this appropriate meaning. The Sleep deity (*Nidra*) thus (considering) did not come to him who was in the habit of female company though he was alone

207 D confirms the correction made by I on account of his MS and moreover restores in pida c the true reading *tava paśyatu carso pi* (viz *ripam*) See F's note on I, 121

16 28 B has here *drsta* instead of *dr̥ṣṭya* (D) a not unfrequent clerical error

52 foll The two rival hosts of the Asuras who favour Surya prabha and of the Vidyadhivas the followers of Āruta cārman are to meet together at the place named Vālmika in order to witness the appearance of a sign of future domination. The *lakṣana* of the future Cakravartin over the realm of the Vidyadhivas will there be visible. What that sign shall be is not expressed in Br's text. In the sequel (vs 62—85) it is narrated that this sign shows itself a quiver appearing at first in the shape of a serpent. Neither Ārutacārman nor any of his men was able to lay hold of it but Suryaprabha seized it and in that very moment it changed into a priceless quiver. Now D names the quiver already in vs 52 it has in pida c *tunam* instead of *turnam* (Br). And in 53 it reads *sainyasamudhina* whereas Br has *sainya samudhina*. Both variants are real emendations as clearly appears if we transcribe the two ślokas in full and modify I's translation accordingly

tasya copadyate tatra lakṣanā cakravartinā
tunam Vidyadhivā guntī tatkrte catra tūn tūlīm (52)
caram Sumeruṇa prokte sainyasamudhina dinam
miti pratar yayis tat te Vālmikā sabalī ratnāḥ (53)

(I I 136) And on that day there is produced there a sign to shew the future emperor a quiver and for that reason

the Vidyādharas are going there that day (I, 437) After Sumeru had spoken thus, they spent that day with the arrangement of the army, and went on the morrow to Valmīka in chariots with their army " I have italicized my modifications As to *samudhā*, cp 115, S

- 159 Br *yā ca 'agamyā hr̥tā jñāteḥ Sunītha tanaya trayā*
The singular *jñāteḥ* is strange to express „your carrying off from her relations”, as T (I, 441) necessarily translates, the connection of the title excludes here the mention of but one relative Better is D *hr̥tājñāte* = ‘carried off stealthily [= *hr̥ta* + *ajñāte*]

- 47, 97 The trifling absence of one vowel sign has perverted the meaning of the second line of this śloka in Br A great and undecisive battle has taken place The night has put an end to it The wives of Suryaprabha who have to deplore the loss of relatives fallen in that battle meet together in the night to console each other „But even on that melancholy occasion [*śudhitasare*] they indulged in miscellaneous conversation ’ For, as the poet adds with a gnomic turn (Br)

śrīnam na ca kṣano yatra na kathasv aparāśrayāḥ

It is not easy to understand the last word *Parāśraya* and its negation *aparāśraya* whether taken as a tatpuruṣa or as a bahuvrīhi seem to be out of place here, nor will *apara* (= other) + *śraya* (resting place, support) be of use T, translating the line thus ‘there is no occasion on which women are not irrelevant in their talk’ (I, 451), has analysed the compound, it seems, in this way *a* + *para* (high[est]) + *śraya* = ,resting on [i.e. treating of] not high [= irrelevant] (matter)’ But this interpretation is forced The reading of D satisfies better and gives to the saying of Somadeva its very point D has

śrīnam na ca kṣano yatra na katha svapurāśraya,
the meaning of which is, I think, „there is no occasion on which women would not talk of the *chronique scandaleuse* of their town’

- 114 It is clear that D *prasūdhanojjvala* is preferable to Br *prasūdhena ’ujjvalā*

- 49, 24 Br *darśayāmāsa sac castrā vidyā apy a tatkrāmāt*
That this verse introduces the episode of Guṇaśarman, the gifted minister, displaying his skill at arms, appears

from the sequel For this reason there can be no doubt that D is right reading instead of *sacchāstravidyā* — a strange turn to express 'skill in the nobler studies' (T I, 460) — *śastrāstravidyā* = „his skill in handling both kind of weapons, for striking and throwing” Similarly at çl 5 D has the good reading *kalāśastrāstravād*, where B₁ reads *kalāśāstravād*

102 foll

I cannot account for *lorambandhādī* in vs 102, the reading of both D and B₁, but there can be no doubt as to the purport of this word, whether it be corrupted or uncorrupted But the following ślokaś (103—108) which are quite obscure in B₁, recover their proper meaning in D T did not know how to translate them well and adopted B₁'s conjecture that there must be a gap after 101, cp the note of Brockhaus on p 235 of his edition of „Buch VI, VII, VIII” (Leipzig, 1862) From D it appears, however, that nothing is wanting I write out its text

- tam ca lorambandhādī Gaudam kārayatum vṛpam*
 (103) *viśasarya sa dutam sīam guptam āptam divyudhamah*
tam dr̥ṣṭva tatā sūdas tam āpto rajanam abhyadhāt
 (104) *aham te sudharyay etat kṛiyam, mūrthakṣayam kṛthāh*
ity ukṭva bandharyitva tam sa dutam Guṇaīrmanah
 (105) *sūdo mantrāsūtīm rakṣann ihāgūd viśadūyakah*
tanmadhye ca palayyanta tato nigatya bandhanat
 (106) *Guṇaīrmanāntikam dutas tadīyah so bhyupagamat*
tenādhyatavittuntenolva sarīam sa darīṣitah
 (107) *sūdo mahannase 'smakam praviṣto Guṇaīrmanah*¹⁾
tato jnatvā sa dhūrtiṇa supakṛd brahmabandhūna
 (108) *viśadunodyatas tena tadbhgam acedya ghatitah*

The few corrections in D are important enough to substitute a clear and consistent account for the confused and obscure facts, involved in B₁ and to dispel the difficulty mentioned by Brockhaus 11 „auch fehlt ein Moment in der Erzählung, etc” It is in çl 104, not 105, that the cook of the Gaudī king is spoken of at the first time Queen Aśokavatī, in her anger against the faithful minister Guṇaīrman who had declined her propositions of love, makes a false report of him to king Mahīśenā, her husband, telling him this invented story

¹⁾ So already proposed is conjecture is 2, çl 1 is note 2 on 1, 411

of herself Guṇaṣarman had despatched one of his servants as a messenger to the Gauda king to make a bargain for the sake of treason. Thereupon the cook of the Gauda counselled his lord to commit to himself the work of killing Mahāseṇa by poison, so he might reach his aim without loss of money (*mārthakṣayam kṛthāh* 104) The cook then, after persuading his master and making him cast into prison Guṇaṣarman's messenger, that the secret could not transpire (*mantrasrutim rakṣan* 105), set out for Ujjayinī to perform his purpose In the meanwhile the messenger made his escape from prison, succeeded in coming back to Guṇaṣarman and told him that which had happened Thus informed G., realizing that he could make no profit by the murder of Mahāseṇa, his master, overtook the cook in the royal kitchen, in which he had entered already and „denounced him and so had him put to death”

The only difficulty that remains is in the first pāda of 106 If the text is genuine, it is 1st said that the messenger *ran away and made his escape* or even more literally, *made his escape from prison after running away* and 2nd *tanmadhye* = „in the meanwhile” Both statements are improbable the former implies an awkward mode of expression and a *π-ερος -ροτερος* opposite to the habits of Sanskrit composition, as to the latter, *tanmadhye* is not synonymous with *atrantare* and cannot have another meaning but „in the midst (amid) of it (them)”

I propose to correct the evident corruption by conjecture

tadā kṣacupalyenaiva tato nrgatya bandhanāt
= „afterwards (*tatah*), having made his escape from prison *in consequence of the negligence of his gaoler(s)*”

This correction restores the sense and is not inconsistent with the paleographical account of the origin of the deprivation of the text

120 D = 121 Br „For in the beginning wicked women sprang from Lying Speech” So T (I, 464) translates the line which in B runs thus

śūdrā asatya-vacanāt pāpā jāni hi kṣtriyāḥ

The double designation of the wicked women by *pāpāḥ* and by *kv-* makes us suspect the genuineness of the transmitted words D, indeed, has this different wording

śūdra asatyavacanāṃ paścāñ jānā hi kṣtriyāḥ

= For in the beginning Lying Speech was born thereafter wicked women

227—229 D = 229—231 B1 In four places of these three ślokas D's text greatly improves both the style and the sense. It has (227) *svkham* and *unchasy* [as I already proposed I 470 n 1] instead of *siyam* and *vañchaty* (Br) (228) *tadesa* for *na dosho* (B1) 231, where B1 *more solito* has left out a full word [cp *supra*, p 65] it fills up the gap reading *tristha <gnato> yatlecchasi*. Accordingly T's translation (I 470) is to be modified in such a manner as I indicate by italicizing my corrections. And as for your *striving for happiness by abandoning* the body in this also you are led astray for in the next world suicides suffer more severe pains than here. *Therefore this folly is* unbecoming to one so young and wise *as you are* decide for yourself you must certainly do what I tell you. I will have made for you here a spacious and beautiful subterranean dwelling many Sundari and live at ease in it *unknown*.

50 1 I has very well seen that *Calara api* (B1) cannot be right. The wild Çabaris have nothing to do in this battle of Asuris and Vidyadharis. He was also right in supposing that the arrows are meant not the wild forest tribes. D reads the pāda *yadyanti siva cara api* even the arrows (shot by the two hosts) fought with each other.

54 Brahma counselling Indra to make peace with his foes ends his speech with the words rendered by I (I 474) thus. These are now favoured by Siva so it is not now a time of victory for you make peace with your foes. The original concluding line is in Br

tad na ayam jaya kīlo'at sandhni kuruta vgrahat
I do not think I intended to make a literal rendering of the last word which is here quite unmeaning for neither with wars nor with bodies — what other meaning can *vgrahat* purport? — is consistent with the context. Now D once more restores the sense. It has *sandhni kuruta kīu grataih?* = make peace what is the use of fighting? This meaning of *grata* is registered in PW s v II c 5 *Kumpfanströmung* = *रणनिग्रम* but only testified to from dictionaries, cp

also PWK, II, s. v. II, c, S, where the sphere of this signification is extended

D 157 = Br 155 Here, too, D's text is decidedly preferable

*tatvātam ca ghaṇāślesadaśanacchadaḥkhandanaiḥ
tyājayitva śanaiḥ lajjām navodhānsulabhām tatuh*

Br has *cumbanāślesha°* and *tyājayitvā śanaiḥ kāntām navodhām sa°* And in 158 (D) = 159 (Br) we read
ratam anasīditam anyābhyah, for *anāsāditam*

52, 185 T (I, 503 in *fine*) „Then Jivādatta rose up delighted and praised Duṣṭī” Here B has *antāmbikah* If it had been possible that T knew the reading *na tāmbitah* (so D), he would have preferred it, I think, and translated „— and bowed to Duṣṭā” which is more adapted to the situation Moreover the use of *anta-* in this very connection, though unrepachable by itself, seems somewhat uncommon

54, 60 T (I, 528) „After remaining there for four days thus occupied” = *etam sthitiā atra caturo dyaśān* (Br.) D has a more elegant turn *etam sthitiā tīrcaturān dyaśān* „— for three or four days”

235 The second part of this *śloka* is a sententious saying of the poet on the occasion of the capture of some queen by the king after vanquishing her husband and making him a prisoner Her he put into his zenana and she underwent that change of husbands rather willingly, for, *viz* Somadeva,

kāma-mohapavittānām ca bālā dharmaiḥ saṁ

So D, Br has *capalā*, not *ca bālā* I think, D is right, and translate the sentence in a manner somewhat different from T (I, 536) „in those who *act up to their desires* (kāma) or *their delusion* (moha) the impressions of virtue (dharma) are impure [properly variegated, spotted, *viz* have lost their white, pure colour]”.

239 D *etam bahun apīripunī abhaya-javarttān* *jayati* is doubtless better than Br *samarapavarttān*, that it is a victory ‘in the front of battle’ is expressed by *saṁyugamūrdhni* in *pīḍa d* and is not in need of another tautological expression

241 In Br *mudgā saṁgitarasāgatām tathā / nṛām sa gōyan stayam anganāsakhah* etc the second word is difficult to analyse without hurting either the grammar or the sense T's (I, 537) translation, therefore, is philologically speaking,

insufficient, *samgitarasagata nica* is not adequate to a night, which was devoted to the amusement of a concert D hrs, indeed, a different reading *ninaya samgitarasaca tam* etc. as he was fond of music, he spent that night etc

55, 9

Erroneous division of one word into two — *mūlha bhava* instead of *murkhabhava* — impairs the understanding of Nāṭyaśāstra's reproach of Māribhūti that he has answered with a joke the claim of his servant, whose wages he had not paid. Translation of this line (I, 537) 'what are you thinking about, you fool? Your intentions are not over creditable' depends on Br. In D the line has this form

ka m eiam murkhabhavas te nadlikeyam matas tara
I take both sentences for interrogations and translate thus 'Is your stupidity (still) such? Does your wit not exceed it?'

27

I rendering this sloka into English, subjoins in a note (I 538) the puns here defy translation. The poet uses here the rhetorical figure named *parisamkhyā*. In Br it encompasses three links but in D there are four. It is obvious that D's reading

*yatra bandha kavirum chedah pattresi adicyata
bhango lakṣu nūnam sasyasavirahane klalah*

is preferable to that of Br (*sala* instead of *chedah*)

67

And then she made me paint a very handsome youth slowly tracing out the form on the ground with nectaring nectar distilling hand to guide me (I I 510) What is a nectar distilling hand that traces a form on the ground? This is hard to understand from D it appears that (Br) *panna amita caritna* is a false reading. In D the line runs thus

ity alia repavaneena panna dhitacaritna

It is not a nectar distilling but a pencil holding hand that traces the figure of the young man

79

Rohidevi having excited the curiosity of king Kṛṣṇa about the princess whose likeness he has painted is summoned to show the picture. He obeys and

*tato calgulikantalstham dista patani adarṣayat
sa citrakṛt tam citrastham rajno Madanasundarim*

So Br 'The painter accordingly shewed the king Madana's sundari in a painting' (I I, 510) but the preparatory

action is here rather obscure. Its translation, 'Then the painter looked out a piece of canvas which was in a bag endeavours to make the best of it. Especially *dṛṣṭva* is strange in this connection where one expects to read that Roladeva drew the painting out of the bag. Yet D has this very sense reading

lato valgulikutas tam hr̥stva patam adarṣayat

Then the painter drew the piece of canvas from the bag etc

- 175 Kṛṇḥakavṛṣa enters the temple of Kumārī, which bears the epithet of 'sanctifying temple' (F I, 545) in Br (*śvecā garbhābhavanam tasya devasya pavakam*). For the last word D has *parakeḥ*. Pāvaka is an epithet of Kumārī = Skandā Kuttikēya

- 216 T's translation (I 547) of the account how the king escaped the assault of the furious elephant is right as far as it expresses that which ought to be said in Br

When the king saw that he fled by a way full of holes etc. is not an adequate rendering of *tam dṛṣṭva cābhra margena sa rāja upasarat talā*. D, once more presents the right reading *rajapasarat talā*

- 234 Kṛṇḥakavṛṣa has regained his wife and returns home, passing by the possessions of his father-in-law king Devaśakti. How then is it likely that Somadeva related his arrival at the residence of Devaśakti, in the way as is related upud T (I 515). And in a few days he reached the residence of his father-in-law a hermitage in the country of Vīdarbhā and after that his wealthy city of Kūṇḍina.²⁹ A reigning king does not keep his residence in a hermitage. From D it appears that it is not Somadeva but some copyists error that brought in the word *acramam*, as is edited in Br. D has *acrita*. Here is the whole pṛthivī stanza in its corrected shape

*atīpa ca sa rasarāt katipayair gr̥hā : cācrañ
Vīdarbhārajapūrtā tad atla Kūṇḍinīkṛpā purāñ |
saurddhīmatī tatra ca śācūrasakṛtā kāmīñ
dīnany abhajāta sthīrāñ tanayadīrasenayutā ||*

Therefore he did not come at first to a hermitage in Vīdarbhā and afterwards to Kūṇḍina but it is narrated that he reached Kūṇḍina the capital of his father-in-law situated in Vīdarbhā and stayed there for some days

56, 78—80 B₁ supposes here a gap of two lines (79 b, 80 a in his edition), probably he was induced to do so by the beginning of 80 b *iti mrbandhapista ca* But there is nothing wanting D reads *atimrbandhapistā ca* When the Mothers asked her the first time, she laughed without giving reason of her laughing (*sa jahasa tu nabhrāt*) But on their strong instances she told it them

57, 12 In the story of the porter who found king Udayana's bracelet and sold one jewel out of it, a slight correction in the text and accordingly in I's translation (II, 2) is to be obtained from D, where the śloka 12 is thus edited

etac chūta sa Vatsēṣas tatvanayayati sma tau

bhūrikam tam savatayanī saratnam vanyam ca tam
Udayana summoned the porter to come with the bracelet and the merchant with the jewel B₁ has *sarvayam sadratnavanyam* Likewise śl 9 D corrects the vicious reading of B₁ *sadratnakatakam*, reading *saratnam katakam* a bracelet beset with jewels

16 Though the lection *vanyas* of this śl — B₁ *rakṣartham*, D *ratnavatnam* — does not affect the sense I greatly doubt, whether *rakṣartham* may have in good Sanskrit the meaning of 'for keeping for himself' and for this reason should prefer the reading of D

58 98 In the story of Vajrasūra whose wife cut off his nose and ears (T II 11 foll) the ironical turn of the poet's words representing the state of mind of the foolish husband whom his passion of sensual love compels to deliver himself to the rage of his faithless wife is almost lost in the corrupted form of śl 98 b in B₁ for *citra* as is edited there, D has *citra* having the line as follows

trnasurikṛtaḥ citram Iajasuro Manobhūta

it is a wonder how a Vajrasūra [= who has the hardness of a diamond] was made by the Love god to a tinasūra [= who has the hardness of stubble] — Some lines before, śl 91 a D reads *upateṣya* for *upateya* (B) rightly, for when he had entered the den of wood, he made sit down his wife before speaking to her

113 114 In the relation of the prowess of Sindhulā fighting lions and elephants in the wilderness two variances of reading are remarkable, since they slightly change the meaning According to D, he did not strip the elephant whom he killed of his jewel (I II 16) but he made the

elephant full down roaring. Instead of *muktaratnam* (B.) D reads *muktaratim*, cp 52, 123 where the same adj is found, in the same situation, in both editions (cp also 70, 94 the partic *avalatsu*). And in the comparison of the bandits overthrown by him with lotusponds trampled down by an elephant, D adds the adjective „fresh” to the subst “lotus-es”, it reads çl 114 thus

*ekahi taskaracamur ivalan narapanhajāh
mamāthūranayākrantah kani kamalinir na*

By this the *çloka* recovers its genuine form. In Br’s text (*ivalann na*) the repeated *na* is intolerable, and *panhajāh* (acc fem.) disturbs the sentence. In D *narapanhajāh* is a bahuvrīhi and the attribute of *kamalinir*.

139 *Samam* (Br) appears from D to be a mistake. In D the tristubh is edited in its original form

*tatah sa samprapya punah svarajyam
ānaya bhūryām ca pitur gṛhāt tām etc*

60, 151 D = 155 B. In the Story of the Lion, the Panther, the Crow and the Jackal it is related how the attendants of the wounded lion contrive a plot by which they will induce the camel to offer himself his own body to the lion. The crow who is charged with the execution of the contrivance entices the camel by a false message to make that offer. This part of the story is introduced by a *çloka* which is somewhat different in B. and in D. B. *ity ukte tan, anujātas tena sinhena vāyasah*

vidhāya samvidam gatvā karabham tam abhāshata

D the first line identical, the second *vidhāya samvidam kṛtvā karabham etc*. We may supersede to demonstrate that and why D’s reading seems to be better. Sanskrit T’s translation (II, 36) should be modified, in accordance with it, in this manner „When they had said this, the crow, by the permission of the lion, after arranging the plot to kill him, addressed that camel with these words”

61, 126 The snare in which the antelope Citrāṅga is caught, is called *kālapāṇa* in Br — in T’s translation (II, 32) „the fatal noose” — but *kālapaṇa* in D, which word is expressive of the kind of trap used, some pin or wedge being employed.

145 foll In this passage, which treats of the beautiful wife of a jealous husband falling in love with a young Bhilla

with whom she elopes from her house (T II, 53), Tawney has adopted (çl. 147) the reading *pallim* from his MS instead of *patnim* (B₁). D likewise has *pallim* and these more corrections of B₁'s text çl 145 *mange śa Bhallām atarim agre dr̥ṣṭū śa tadbhayāt*, çl 146 *dhr̥ṣṭā yayau tatah for dr̥ṣṭū* („she boldly eloped”)

62, 13 and 103 The word *aradya* ‘blameful’ has been twice obscured in this taṅga in B₁, whereas it reappears in D The first line of çl 13

yoddhayam tena sūham no gatiā ’araṣena śatruṇā (B₁) has this form in D

y t s no krtūvadyena śatruṇā = „we must fight with that enemy who acted blamefully towards us”. T (II, 64) translates „we must go and fight with that feeble enemy”. Neither the idea of weakness nor its expression here by *araca* fit the situation, but *krtūvadya* represents the very idea wanted and is its proper expression.

Çl 103 *krtūvadyasya* (B₁) is an obvious misprint for *krtūvadyasya*. I do not understand why T (II, 71) has rendered it by „a hereditary enemy”.

63, 108 In T's translation, II, 84, begins the famous story of the Monkey and the Porpoise, which Somadeva narrates at large and with amplifications. With him, the wife of the porpoise has a confidante by whose intermedium she makes known to her husband her desire of being cured with a soup made of the heart of a monkey. The porpoise reflected „Alas! how shall I obtain the lotus like heart of a monkey? Is it right for me to plot treachery against the monkey, who is my friend? On the other hand how else can I cure my wife whom I love more than my life? In this reflection which I quote from T, there is nothing inconsistent, but the words „how else can I cure’ do not answer exactly to the text of Br *sādhyā kim athavā bhūya*, since not *kim athavā*, but *katham* or *katham anyatha* would be required to represent that meaning. From D it appears that something different is said. Instead of *sādhyā* it has *sakhyā*, and the whole line has accordingly this form, in transcription and adding the punctuation *sakhyā kim? athavā bhūyā prānebhyo ’py adhikapriyā* = „What matters me my friend? It is my wife, forsooth, whom I love more than my life”.

- 168 In the odd story of the teacher and his two jealous pupils (T II, 88) there is a trait which, owing to the bad reading in Br, is misrepresented. The pupil who washed and anointed every day the right foot of his teacher being abroad, the teacher asks his second pupil who was in charge of his left foot, to wash and anoint the right one also. That pupil refused, as the right foot belonged to his rival. When the teacher insisted, then that pupil, *who was the opposite of a good pupil*, took hold of his master's foot in a passion, and *exerting great force*, broke it. The words printed in italics are wrong; they rest on Br's false reading

tato vipakṣhaḥ sac cīṣhyād iśhād adaya tasya tam

guroḥ cīṣhyah sa caranam balād gādhaḥ ca bhagnavān, here the awkward and not idiomatic expression *vipakṣah sacchīṣyat* to denote 'a bad pupil, the tasteless style unworthy of an elegant poet such as Somaśeṇa, and the strange turn *balād gādhaḥ* made me a priori suspicious about the genuineness of the lines thus edited. All this trouble vanishes if we adopt the redaction of D

tato vipakṣat acchīṣyati śud adaya tasya tam

guroḥ cīṣyah sa caranam balad graṇa ca bhagnavān = then this pupil in a fit of anger at the (other) pupil, his rival took hold of that foot of his master and broke it violently with a stone

- 179 D = 180 Br The story of the snake with two heads" contains several various readings in Br and D which do not affect the meaning. A bad reading of the concluding śloka which he found in his mss. induced Blochhaus to suppose a gap of one śloka between 178 and 180. This is quite unnecessary, if we read with D

avate 'gṇau paribhāṣito murgadr̥ṣter adahyata

- 184 D = 185 Br In the story of the foolish man who had put a handful of rice into his mouth in the house of his father-in-law and was surprised by his mother-in-law it is said in P's translation (II, 89) 'his mother-in-law, seeing that his throat was swollen and distended'. Of course there can be no question of his *throat*, though Br edits *gala*, D has the very word required here, *galla talpinocchunagallam ca*. This correction restores at the same time the fault against the metre in Br. He had not a swollen throat, but a swollen *cheek*.

- 61, 101 * Dhanadeva returning home is informed of the misconduct of his dissolute wife. She lets down every night a basket, „and whoever enters it is drawn up into the house, and is dismissed in the same way at the end of the night. And the woman is always stupefied with drink, so that she is absolutely void of discernment.” (I II, 96) The last sentence is çl 101, c d. In B₁ it has this shape

pāna-mattā 'araçā nana vicārayati kimcana

In D it is edited as follows

pānarattā ca sū nana nibhālayati kimcana

Pānarattā must be a misprint, B₁ *pānamatta* is right. But the other variance of D, which I have marked by spacing, restores the original wording, misread by B₁. Note the new instance of the verb *nibhālayati* 'to consider' — In çl 102 D *bahukālo gato* is also an improvement (Br *bahukālagato*).

67, 57

The merchant who tells Naravāhanadatta his adventures, narrates his despondency, when the news was spread of the shipwreck of the vessel on which his bride made the journey to Ceylon. „So I, though comforted by my elders, made up my mind *to throw away my property and prospects* and I determined to go to that island to ascertain the truth” (I II, 128). The words printed in italics are the translation of the pāda *cittam āçābhū akṣipam* (Br), which for several reasons rouse doubt as to their genuineness. D, in fact, has a much better reading *cittam āçābhū akṣipam*. The merchant says, that after the consolation of his elders, *he cherished his mind with hope and determined etc.*

70, 31

Çrutadhī after saying his name and that of his father, thus continues

(B₁) *sa ca mayā saha*

durbhikṣhe mṛtajātih san bhīman prāpad imām bhūmam „and once in a time of famine he was wandering about with me, and he reached this place almost dead” (I II, 148). These last words 'almost dead' have to render *mṛtajātih*, but this translation is impossible. The compounds in °*jātīya* are synonymous with those ending in °*kalpa* = 'almost', but not those in °*jāti*, and if *mṛtajāti* signifies anything, it must be = 'having lost by death his clan (or caste)'. Br's reading is the consequence of a misreading. D has *mṛtajāntih* 'having lost by death his wife', and

so Somadeva wrote, as is confirmed by the parallel passage in Kṣemendra, where the cause of her death, too, is reported. She starved from hunger, after giving away her food to a beggar.

tatah kadācit durbhikṣe mātā me nyabhajanam

dattānīthine kṣudhātāya dhanyā tatyūjajvītam (IX, 1, 196)

- 95 In this śloka the interrupted meditation of some merciful ascetic is mentioned 'who discharged fire at the webs' (T II, 151) of two sets of spiders, hanging one on wholesome flowers and the other on poisonous flowers.

This allegorical representation of the power of tapas and dhyāna to destroy the textures of karma, though consistent with the whole imagery sketched, is not quite accurate if tested by the very words of the original. T translated *Bī kenāpi jālato mukta tato jvalā tapasvina*. Now, it is impossible to express the conception „to discharge fire at the webs” by the words *jālato jvalām muñcati*. The word ending in *tas* can only signify the source of the fire, not its aim. Here again, D restores the hand of Somadeva, who wrote *kenāpi bhūlato mukta* etc., the ascetic made fire break forth out of his forehead. Cp Ćiva's front-eye, e.g. Kathās 104, 2, where *bhulekṣana* has remained intact in Br. *Bīhatkathāmanjari*, IX, 1, 236, the parallel place has also *tallalātasamutthugni*.

- 71, 39 The queen says to the warder, apud T (II, 156) „When the king was seized that day by monsters in the water of the Narmadā, Mriginkadatta alone was ready to rescue him.” I do not object to this translation, but the verb *was seized*, which is here indispensable, does not answer to Br *āghrāto bhūt*. One would rather expect *akrānto 'bhūt*, as is, in fact, found in D.

- 147 An anusvāra wrongly put, or perhaps even wrongly believed to have been put on the aks 𑂔 has disturbed the wording of the first line of this śloka in Br. T (II, 161) thus translating „Out on the spite of destiny! she brings trouble on her handiwork, even when full of excellencies” made the best of it. But his rendering of *ahhah* (sm) by 'trouble' proves his conviction that a literal translation would lead him to non-sense. Now, if we put together Br's text

gunavatyām sva-sriṣṭāv apy anho, dhig matsaro vidheh'
and that of D (which I transliterate, adding the punctuation)

gunavatyām svasiṣṭāv apy aho dhim matsaro vidheh'
there can be no doubt, I suppose, that the latter alone is right Hamsāvali exclaims „O! What a pity that Destiny feels jealousy towards her creation, even when full of excellencies!”

- 252 In Hamsāvali's outcry the words *hā uparīṭāmdhe vidhe'* (Br) are translated by T (II, 167) „alas! Destiny, source of untowards events!” But *mdhi* means ‘treasury’ not ‘source’, if T had put ‘treasury’, the likeness would have lost its proper application Br has been induced into error, it seems, by his MSS reading °*mdhe* instead of °*vidhe*, as is edited in D, which makes a better meaning „Alas! she cries, Destiny, operator of wrong decisions”
Cp *supra*, p 70

- 295 *Udghāta* has been misunderstood by T (II, 169) He was misled by the acc pl in Br From D it is clear that the right reading is *smṛtiodghātāt*, abl sing *Udghāta* has among others the meaning ‘hint’, ‘allusion’ — cp PWK, I, 231, s v 5) „das zur Sprache kommen” testif Kathās 17, 3 —, and so it must be understood here Owing to Çrutadhi's hint about the wondrous peacock, the king of the Bhūllas changes his mind Parallel places of ours are 35, 27 and 68, 13 *lac chrutana tadudghātāt smṛtīā*, where B₁ has *udiatāt* „fehlerhaft für *udghāta*” PWK, I 234 Cp Kathās 3, 65 *upodghāta* with a similar sense, and 27 79 in both places this word is a neuter *Mudrarakṣasa* Act III (beginning) *kim anena iah pranaharena kathodghatena?*

- 72, 292 The young merchant Malayamalin has miserably fallen in love with the king's daughter His friend, on hearing that cause of his sorrow and altered state, reminds him of the hopelessness of his love „Let the swan, he says, desire the beautiful face of the lotuses of all ordinary lakes, but what has he to do with the delight of enjoying the lotus of that lake, which is the navel of Viṣṇu?” (T II, 185) By the bye, I remark that there is here perhaps some pun on *lakṣmi*, which T has translated by ‘delight’, and which may also signify the wife of Viṣṇu. In fact, the princess is as distant from the merchant as

Lakṣmī is from the swan. But it is not for this reason that I treat of this place but because of the discrepancy between B1 and D. Br s text runs thus (292 b-293 a)

*lāṁso vāñclatu nama anyā saṁo vībhūṣa mukha śrīyam
hara nabhi /radambhōṣa bhōṣa lakṣmyai sa kal punak?*

whereas D reads

lāṁso vāñclatu namanyasaro vībhūṣa mukha śrīyam

Harinabhi /radambhōṣa bhōṣa lakṣmyai sa kal punak?

The reading *sukla* for *mukla* is an evident correction as to the genitive °*lakṣmyai* it satisfies better than the instrumental of B1's text which it is not easy to account for. The genitive is the dative-like one (cp Jātaka māṇi p. 221. 15 *has tv alāṁ varapradanasya*). Used in this manner with *ka* it is a synonymous turn with the usual idiom *kā ca* (cp my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 410 Rem. and Kathis 74. 204).

296 Instead of the meaningless last pada of B1 *taya aṁtya alāṁ kṛtyak* P (note on II. 185) from one London MS reads *taya dṛtyakarot* etc. D has *tayā vṛtṭyakarot* *īṇyā*.

73 81 101 (B1) *prākṛisṭabhyam* D has *praviṣṭabhyam* which is more appropriate to the situation. Instead of bestowing on the goddesses Cīn and Śarasvatī who claim each for herself the superior rank in Kāṣmī that paradise on earth the *epiteton ornans* glorious the text of D makes them contend at the time of their entrance in that divine country. After *penetrating into* Kāṣmī (and becoming aware of its wondrous loveliness) they exclaim one *alāṁ atradīka* and the other *nīlāṁ* [= *na alāṁ* Br].

74 226 From the IO MS I (note on II. 226) has adopted the reading *dhutam anuddṛtya* for *anugatya* (B1) which is out of place. D has another reading quite satisfactory and almost equivalent to *anuddṛtya* viz *anadrtya*.

75 41 foll. In the description of king Vikramāditya leaving his palace in the dark night alone and unperceived to ask of the sorcerer — introduction of Vet laparacimṣatikī — D corrects B1's text in several places. Besides that (vs. 40) it divides in accordance with Boethlingk (*Restor. allie*° p. 110. 30 *pratipannī* to the two following ślokaś have this form

pradoṣe nilāśanaś tāmalaḥṭaṣekharaḥ
 niyayau vajdhūntaḥ khaḍgarau alakṣitaḥ ||
 yayan ca ghorāmbidadhūntaḥ utamaśīmasam
 citanalogīanayaṇaḥ ālādīn vṇadarcanam || .

Whether *nayana* is the right correction of *tapana* (B), is not certain, but in the first line the new reading seems to make a better sense than B's *nilavasanasa malamhi ta cekkharah* ¹), which is not quite = T (II, 233) 'he enveloped his head in a black cloth'. According to D, the king had taken the precaution to wear a black dress and to paint a dark brown tilakā on his forehead (*tamālakī tacekharā*).

- 62 D *tasyabhūḥ Vajramukulas tanayo rūpaṣaṇḍayayoh*
kuṇḍano darpadalanam Smarasyaṇḍanasya ca
kuṇḍano for akaroḍ (th) restores the grammatical structure
of the sentences.

- 80 T (II 235), What did you not see what she told you by her signs? These words of the minister's son to the prince convey the very meaning of their Sanskrit original yet in Bi (and consequently in Bochtlingk's *Christ* - p 113) they are badly expressed the line

Im na drishtam taya, gad yat samjaya sucitam taya
 can have no other meaning but this—did you not see,
whatsoever she told etc. D restores the genuine wording.

- 140 This sloka has become almost unintelligible owing to a mistake in transcribing of B1, it seems. He has edited
śail munna manyam elasyam' bandha tyagan mahatmanah
kuryat nam bhavane yuttim lakshyamy alochayamy ahari
 from the spelling °*tyagan* and from the interpunction we may suppose that B1 took °*tyagan* for in acc. plur.' this reception and the strange asyndeton of the two verbs one being a future and the other a present tense raise a strong presumption of corruption. I (II, 239) translated rather the purport of his Sanskrit text than its very words. His translation, "persuade the high spirited woman to leave her relations, and I will invent and tell you in artifice for carrying her off" is virtually right. The right constitution of the text appears from D. I subjoin it adding the interpunction

) So in italics, for Br π it that is an error of print

²⁾ Towers is yet must be read with D 118, 167, where Br has *tal*

tan muñca mañyūm etasyām' bandhutyāgūn mahātmanah
luryās tām harane yuktīm, rakṣyāmy ālocya yām aham
 the gen *mahātmanah* depends on *harane* and *bandhuty*
 is an abl sing

78, 37 Viravara, the heroic officer, who is immediately ready to execute the perilous order of the king, his master, sets out for the weeping woman in the darkest of the night (cf 36) It is very strange that the poet should describe his behaviour, when starting, so awkwardly as is done in Br's edition

nava meghāndhakāśam taj-jalad ıdyud ılocanam

sthūla dhāśā śilā varṣu Rakṣo jūam aṣṣanat (37),
 in T's translation (II, 252) rendered thus „He looked upon the world as a Rākshasa black with fresh clouds, having the lightning flashing from them by way of an eye, running large drops of rain instead of stones” It is not the comparison of the dark raining night to a Rākṣas which wonders the reader most, but the poet's remark that this imagination rose up in the mind of Viravara Now, in D the reading is slightly different, but brings us the natural and proper conception which is wanting in Br for *nava* it has *na ca*, and for *Rakṣo jūam* *Rakṣorupam* Further *taj* should be loosened from the compound *jālad*^o and put aside as a separate word The whole, then, means thus „He did not mind that Rākṣas-like darkness, black etc”

80. 10 T, in his note 2 on II, 312, mentions the reading *tathā* of the Sanskrit College MS for *taya* (Br) Br's *prishṭo mātṛā taya* must be corrupt, as *tayā* cannot be accounted for But the true correction is in D *prīṣṭo mātṛārtaya* when his mother *distressed* asked him the cause (of his strange behaviour)”

81, 16 The king being astray in the wilderness, asks his dependent and only companion „Do you know the way by which we came?” The other replies „I do know it, but let my lord rest here for some time” (T II, 265 in fine) T translated well that which must be read in the text, but is not in Br, where we find *cedmī, kimet kṣanam tadā ıha ıśrāmyatu prabhuh* the good reading *cedmī kimet kṣanam* etc is found in D

82, 17 In the conclusion of the ludicrous tale of „the three fastidious men” who being gone off to fetch a turtle

for their father in behalf of his sacrifice never returned, having made their fortune at the court of a foreign king, the poet laughingly states that little did they reckon of the fact that they had incurred sin by obstructing their father's sacrifice' (I II, 273) 'The half śloka of the original translated in this manner is thus edited in Bī

pitar vighnata yajñārtham helopāyita pātakah

The word *hela* is inconvenient if expressive of the obstruction of the *ies* divya, it is a tautology next to *vighnata*, if it denotes the insult wherewith they acted to their father, the word implies too much, for they were guilty of *apramada*, not *hela*. Moreover, the whole expression *yajñārtham heli°* is improper. In fact, the text in Bī is corrupt. The true reading is found in D

pitar vighnatayajñārthaphaloparjitapātakah

= 'though they had incurred sin by obstructing the success of their father's sacrifice'

86 36 * It is plain that D reading the second part of this śloka

evad avastāṣayano nīcam mantri munya tam
is right, not Bī where it has this form *evad apastāṣayano* etc. 1st translation (II 286) the minister, who had long discarded the use of beds spent that night in his house is materially satisfactory but does not exactly answer to the necessary meaning of the phrase *evad apastāṣayanah* which must imply that Dīghraduṣin had a long time ago, taken a vow of not sleeping in a bed *apastāṣayanah* = I at *abjecto lecti usu* D's text signifies that after a long time (*evad*) he had got (again) a bed to pass the night etc.

88 11 12 Bī has here made an odd mistake editing *mulya manah* and *mulyamahe* in a place where it is said that the town was robbed by thieves. The right reading *musya°* and *musya°* is of course found in D

89 76 Munthi mun, feigning to acquiesce to an unjust decision of the king concerning himself, protests indirectly by pointing out the king's responsibility for his own actions. In Bī this passage runs as follows

kumarī tad astu, raja havi dharmadharman tava icitan
= I (II 301) I must I suppose, acquiesce you are a king and justice and injustice are matters familiar to you. How much better D *dharmādharman tava idya*
tau = from hence the righteousness or injustice

(of that which is to be done) is *yours*," it is not I who am responsible for it, but you (who are the dispenser of the *dharma*) who are to enjoy the fruit of the right or injustice you have done by your sentence. So we have caught the very argument in the case from an Indian point of view.

91, 60 Cl 52—60 confirm the verdict of Tivikīrmasena in the case of the king who died from unsatisfied love rather than to accept the ravishing Unmīdinī from the hand of her husband. In its conclusion I prefer D's reading *pānūn api sa dharmātma tatyāja na punah padam/amārge niladhe* to B *pranau api samantāt ca tatyāja* etc., *samantāt* is a mere *pīḍapurāṇa*, but nothing can be more appropriate to the context here than *sa dharmātma*.

93, 9 In Br it is said that the relations of the merchant Dhanurjī after his death „seized his property, as the king did not interfere to protect it" (T II, 323). The words I have put in italics answer to *rājāsānāthyād* (*ākrañtam*) of B. D has thus slightly different text

taddhanam rājasanūthyād ākṛāntam atha gotrajāṣṭh, which imports the very contrary, viz. that the relatives robbed the widow of the inheritance *with the assistance of the king*. D's text is supported by Ksemendra's parallel (IX B 1018) *gotrajāṣṭh/hantum dṛavīnam ākṣipta tadbhūryu rājasamṣṛitāṣṭh* = „his relations backed by the king sued his wife to seize the inheritance."

94, 91 King Candivarloka is bound to the Brahmarakṣas, whom he had unwillingly obstructed, to deliver him a brāhman boy of seven years ready to offer himself in sacrifice for the king's sake. When being in a downcast mind how to fulfil his promise, one of his ministers shows him the way to find out such a boy. He had made with the utmost rapidity a golden image of a seven years old child, and he adorned his ears with jewels and placed it on a chariot, and had it carried about in the towns, villages, and stations of herd-men," with a proclamation of this purport, that if such a brāhman boy is whose image was being carried about, should willingly offer himself for the good of all the creatures, and his mother and father should permit him to do so and should comply to some other hard and requisite conditions, this image of gold and gems together with

a hundred villages would be given them in reward. In the passage quoted from T's translation (II, 339) the sentences „he adorned his ears with jewels, and placed it on a chariot” are to render this line of Br *ratnaṁ alamkṛtām tām cā karne, rāthārputām*. It is clear, however, that „to adorn the ears (of the image)” cannot possibly be expressed in Sanskrit by *alamkṛtām* (viz. *ṣṭatimūḥ*) *karne*, and that this phrase is rather a monstrous lectio. Now, in D this monstrum disappears. For *karṇe rāthārputam* it has *karṇārathārputam*. So the translation is thus to be modified „He had made with the utmost rapidity a golden image of a seven-year-old child and dressed it with ornaments, then he placed it in a palanquin, etc.” The word *karṇāratha* is found also 27, 168, in both Br and D, at 120, 118 D and T's three mss have *karṇārathavatīnū* (see T II, 570 n 1), this has been corrupted in B to *karṇārathāvatīnū*.

95, 4 *asyām* [viz. *puṇyām*] *babhūva napatih Padmanābha ity iṣṭaḥ sajjananandakāḥ śrīmūn ākrāntaḥ Baluṇḍakāḥ*

T (II, 342) rendered this śloka thus „In it there lived a fortunate king, named Padmanābha, who was a source of joy to good men, and excelled King Bali.” T failed to realize the intentional ambiguousness of the epithets King Bali mentioned in the 1st pīṭha needs requires in the name of Padmanābha an allusion to Viṣṇu, one of whose names is, indeed, Padmanābha. Now, D has in the 3rd pada *sacchakṣīnanandakāḥ*. Adopting this reading, we get a worked out pun. King P is compared throughout with Viṣṇu, the possessor of his good discus (*śaṅkha*) and his sword Nandaka, who overpowered (*ākṛānta*) King Bali. If referred to the king, it is said that he was a source of joy to the pious, and brought into his power tributary kings (*baluṇḍa*), cp *supra* p. 82.

98, 35 D *muktā tārāṅghamanditam* seems to be preferable to B *muktā tārāṅghaḥ*, for it is not the fact of her being „adorned with many strings of pearls” (T II, 356), but the striking splendour of her pearls of the finest water that makes impression on the mind of Candāsini. *Tara* has here meaning S) in PW, III 55.

99, 13 The act of sacrifice to the Vetāla, performed by the mendicant, consists of different oblations. The first of them, in B, is an offering „of white human teeth in a

skull' (*sumrmalaṭṭh / nara dantaṭṭh*) by way of an *aṅgha*. In D it is very pure human blood (*suṇ naraṇaṭṭh*) that is offered as an *aṅgha*.

- 12 After finishing his long narrative the 25 Tales of the Vetala, Vikramādeśin comes again to speak of his own adventures. This transition makes up the content of an *aupacchandasika*, the third and fourth *pādas* of which are in B

abhidhaya punaṃ Mṛigankadattam

śaṅkṛtārtham nyagāda rajaputram

It is no wonder that T could not understand *śaṅkṛtārtham*, finding in one of his mss. *śa kṛtārtham* he adopted that reading and translated accordingly the successful prince M" (II, 360). But since in fact M is styled here 'successful' in a rather proleptic way — how could he be a *kṛtārtha*, before he had obtained his beloved maiden? — the reading of D must be considered more satisfactory. D reads the 4th *pāda*

prakṛtārtham nyagāda rajaputram

spoke to the prince (again) of the present subject.

- 46 The old man, after giving to Vikramādeśin the powerful spell by means of which he will regain Mṛigankadatta his master exhorts him with comforting words to follow his advice which he gives him in return of his being relieved of the serpent's poison. The calm stanza which conveys this exhortation is corrupt in its 4th *pāda* and the word *duḥsaṁpa* does not occur in it. In Br the *pāda* has this shape

tvam evaṃ duḥsaṁpa daṇḍanti tarta,

but in D we have doubtless the good reading

tvam me bandhul saṁpadamcātarta

I hold you for my kinsman since you have rescued me of the pain of a serpent's bite. cp I II 361.

- 100 21 In the simile which illustrates the wavering of the foliage of the great and wonderful tree which Mṛigankadatta beholds on the shore of the lake the voices of the birds are forced to say not 'Let no one question me in any way!' (I II 363), but 'Let no one touch me in any way!' D reads *na man gatta tatha karoti sprasidati*, not *prakṛditi* (B).

- 57 The pathetiastic that relates the reunion of Mṛigankadatta with his ministers, runs thus in Br

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadī mantrinaḥ prāpya tan
 dīṣṭā kalatayā gūā pramada manthanāmbhayaḥ |
 nareṣvara suto dhīla pranayam eṣam eṣam muhur
 dadarṣa, parīkṣasāye tad anu sambabhāṣhe kṛitī ||*

Here the 2^d pāda puzzles the reader. What may be the meaning of *kalataya* put between *dr̥ṣṭi* (with his eyes) and *gūā* (with his voice) Bochtlingk declared it a misprint for *kalānaya* = 'with his gestures' see PW V, 1264, yet *kalānā* itself with this meaning has been put in PWK II, s. v. under 3 c) on no other authority but this one and conjectural instance. Further *pramada manthanāmbha* seems suspect. It would be a very uncommon metaphor to employ *manthana*, the well known term for churning to express the idea of agitation applied to something like a voice agitated by the workings of joy (T II 365). Both difficulties are removed in D, where we read

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadī mantrinaḥ prāpya tan
 dīṣṭā kalataya gūā pramadamantharāmbhayaḥ |
 nareṣvara suto dhīla pranayam eṣam eṣam muhur
 dadarṣa parīkṣasāye tad anu sambabhāṣhe kṛitī ||*

In translating this stanza there must be taken account of the figure *yathāsamāhāra* which connects the three ministrants in the 2^d pāda with the verbs in the 1st one and which may have been purposely employed to harmonize with the act described of embracing one after another (*eṣam eṣam*). Therefore I think this translation must be modified in this manner. Then the prince having received all those ministers at the same instant looked at them with his eyes, embraced them with impetuosity and then spoke to them with a faltering voice owing to the emotion of his exceeding love so he saluted them one by one again and again happy by his success.

101, 278 A bad orthography misled Prof. Brockhaus it seems when he put into his text *abjeyu ṣuliku* — in his translation (II 380) the beautiful lotuses, but *ṣalin* = beautiful would be hardly defensible in this connection! In editing *abjeyu ṣuliku* the lotuses with their bees, has preserved the genuine word, which is both in accordance with *plullisu calisu*, its parallel in the preceding link of this chain of absolute locatives and necessary since it is the humming of the bees but

skull' (*sunumalark / naradantark*) by way of an *argha*. In D it is very pure human blood (*sun nararakark*) that is offered as an *argha*.

- 42 After finishing his long narrative the 25 Tales of the Vetāṭṭa, Vikramakeśariṃ comes again to speak of his own adventures. This transition makes up the content of an *upacchandāsika* the third and fourth pādis of which are in B

abhidhaya punar Mṛgāṅkadattam

śakṛtārtham nyagada rājaputram

It is no wonder that T could not understand *śakṛtārtham*, finding in one of his mss *śa kṛtārtham* he adopted that reading and translated accordingly, 'the successful prince M' (II, 360). But since in fact M is styled here 'successful in a rather proleptic way — how could he be a *kṛtārtha* before he had obtained his beloved maiden? — the reading of D must be considered more satisfactory. D reads the 4th pāda

prakṛtārtham nyagada rājaputram

spoke to the prince (again) of the present subject.

- 46 The old man after giving to Vikramakeśariṃ the powerful spell by means of which he will rejoin Mṛgāṅkadatta his master exhorts him with comforting words to follow his advice which he gives him in return of his being relieved of the serpent's poison. The 5th stanza which conveys this exhortation is corrupt in its 4th pāda and the word *dulśarpa* does not occur in it. In Br the pāda has this shape

tam evaṃ dulśarpa dantarkṣṭa

but in D we have doubtless the good reading

tam me bandhul śarpadamantilarkṣṭa

I hold you for my kinsman since you have rescued me of the pain of a serpent's bite. ep. I II 361

- 100 21 In the simile which illustrates the wavering of the foliage of the great and wonderful tree which Mṛgāṅkadatta beholds on the shore of the lake the voices of the birds are fancied to say: not let no one question me in any way! (I II 363) but let no one touch me in any way! D reads *na nany yattu tatha karṣṭa* *aprahṛṣṭa* it, not *prahṛṣṭa* it (B).

- 57 The pithy distich that relates the reunion of Mṛgāṅkadatta with his ministers, runs thus in Br

*tatah sa' sakalān samam sapadi mantrināh prāpya tān
dr̥ṣṭvā kalatayā gūā pramada manthanā'ambhayā |
nareṣvā suto dhīra prāṇayam ekam ekam muhur
dadarṣa, pariśasiṣe tad anu sambabhāṣe kṛtī ||*

Here the 2^d pīḍa puzzles the reader. What may be the meaning of *kalatayā*, put between *dr̥ṣṭvā* (with his eyes) and *gūā* (with his voice) Boettlingk declared it a misprint for *kalanayā* = 'with his gestures, see PW V, 1264, yet *kalanū* itself with this meaning has been put in PWK II, s. v. under 3 c) on no other authority, but this one and conjectural instance. Further *pramada-manthanā'ambha* seems suspect. It would be a very uncommon metaphor to employ *manthana*, the well known term for „churning”, to express the idea of agitation applied to something like a „voice agitated by the workings of joy” (P II, 365). Both difficulties are removed in D, where we read

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadi mantrināh prāpya tān
dr̥ṣṭvā kulitayā gūā pramadamanthanā'ambhayā |
nareṣvā suto 'dhīra prāṇayam ekam ekam muhur
dadarṣa pariśasiṣe tad anu sambabhāṣe kṛtī ||*

In translating this stanza there must be taken account of the figure *yathāsamākhyā* which connects the three instrumentals in the 2^d pīḍa with the verbs in the 1st one and which may have been purposely employed to harmonize with the act described of embracing one after another (*ekam ekam*). Therefore, I think the translation must be modified in this manner: „Then the prince having recovered all those ministers at the same instant looked at them with his eyes, embraced them with impetuosity and then spoke to them with a faltering voice owing to the emotion of his exceeding love, so he saluted them one by one, again and again happy by his success’

101, 278 A bad orthography misled Prof. Brockhaus, it seems when he put into his text *abhyas saṁlīṣu* — in his translation (II, 350) „the beautiful lotuses, but *saṁlīṣu* = ‘beautiful’ would be hardly defensible in this connection! D, editing *abhyas saṁlīṣu* „the lotuses with their bees,” has preserved the genuine word, which is both in accordance with *phullasū calīṣu*, its parallel in the preceding link of this chain of absolute locatives, and necessary, since it is the humming of the bees but

skull (*sunumalath / nara dantath*) by way of an *argha*. In D it is very pure human blood (*sun nararakthath*) that is offered as an *argha*.

- 42 After finishing his long narrative the 25 tales of the Vetala, Vikramakesarī comes again to speak of his own adventures. This transition makes up the content of an *aupicchandāsika* the third and fourth padas of which are in B.

abhidhaya punar Mrigankadattam

śakrītartham nyagada rajaputram

It is no wonder that T could not understand *śakrītartham* finding in one of his mss. *śa kīrtartham* he adopted that reading and translated accordingly the successful prince M" (II 360). But since in fact M is styled here successful in a rather proleptic way — how could he be a *kīrtartha* before he had obtained his beloved maiden? — the reading of D must be considered more satisfactory. D reads the 4th pada

pralīrtartham nyagada rajaputram

spoke to the prince (again) of the present subject

- 46 The old man after giving to Vikramakesarī the powerful spell by means of which he will rejoin Mrigankadatta his master exhorts him with comforting words to follow his advice which he gives him in return of his being relieved of the serpent's poison. The *dharmastotra* which conveys this exhortation is corrupt in its 4th pada and the word *dulśarpa* does not occur in it. In B the pada has this shape

ham eva i dulśarpa dāṣṭhī lāṣṭhī

but in D we have doubtless the good reading

ham me bandhul śarpada i uttilāṣṭhī

I hold you for my kinsman since you have released me of the pain of a serpent's bite. cp. I II 361.

- 100 21 In the simile which illustrates the waving of the foliage of the great and wonderful tree which Mrigankadatta beholds on the shore of the lake the voices of the birds are fancied to say not. Let no one question me in any way! (I II 363) but Let no one touch me in any way! D reads *na na yathā tattha ka ca* *śaralāṣṭhī* *na*, not *pralāṣṭhī* *na* (B).

- 57 The *prthivī* trope that relates the reunion of Mrigankadatta with his ministers runs thus in B.

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadī mantrināḥ prāpya tan
 dr̥ṣṭvā khalatayā gūā pramada manthanaramblayā |
 nareçara suto dīkṣa prāṇayam ekaṁ ekaṁ muhur
 dadarṣa, parivasiṣṭe tad anu sambabhuṣe kṛtī ||*

Here the 2^d pīḍa puzzles the reader. What may be the meaning of *khalataya*, put between *dr̥ṣṭvā* (with his eyes) and *gūā* (with his voice) Boettlingk declared it a misprint for *khalanayā* = 'with his gestures' see PW V, 1261, yet *khalanā* itself with this meaning has been put in PWK II, s. v. under 3 c) on no other authority but this one and conjectural instance. Further *pramada manthanarambha* seems suspect. It would be a very uncommon metaphor to employ *manthana*, the well known term for 'churning', to express the idea of agitation applied to something like a voice agitated by the workings of joy (I II, 365). Both difficulties are removed in D where we read

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadī mantrināḥ prāpya tan
 dr̥ṣṭvā khalataya gūā pramadamanthanaramblaya |
 nareçara suto dīkṣa prāṇayam ekaṁ ekaṁ muhur
 dadarṣa parivasiṣṭe tad anu sambabhuṣe kṛtī ||*

In translating this stanza there must be taken account of the figure *vythasamkhyā* which connects the three instrumentals in the 2^d pīḍa with the verbs in the 1st one and which may have been purposely employed to harmonize with the act described of embracing one after another (*ekaṁ ekaṁ*). Therefore I think L's translation must be modified in this manner. Then the prince having recovered all those ministers at the same instant looked at them with his eyes, embraced them with impetuosity and then spoke to them with a faltering voice owing to the emotion of his exceeding love so he saluted them one by one again and again happily by his success.

- 101 278 A bad orthography misled Prof. Brockhaus: it seems when he put into his text *abhyeṣu çalīṣu* — in L's translation (II 350) the beautiful lotuses, but *çalīṣu* = beautiful would be hardly defensible in this connection! D editing *abhyeṣu sūlīṣu* the lotuses with their bees' has preserved the genuine word, which is both in accordance with *plutīṣu çalīṣu* its parallel in the preceding link of this chain of absolute locatives* and necessary, since it is the humming of the bees but

no sound proper to the lotuses that is represented to utter the phrase expressed in this *śloka*

- 290 The awful prison, into which Sundarasena and his companion were thrown by the Āburas is thus described (F II 381) The prison was full of multitudes of vermin filthy with cobwebs, and it was evident that snakes frequented it as they had dropped there the skins that clung to their throats etc. What is said about the snakes is somewhat shorter in the original which, in B₁, has this form *sneyamunahi sameare munmokan gala lambibhah* and nothing is stated about the dropping of the skins. If we interpret this half *śloka* as philologists we can draw from it only this meaning 'frequency of snakes was betrayed by the snake skins that clung to (their) throats'. Of course this is in fact almost nonsense. D's text is more satisfactory. For *galalambibhah* it has *garitalambibhah*. That the prison was haunted by serpents was to be inferred from the snake skins that clung to the *loles* (in its walls).

- 308 Sundarasena after many adventures, has been reunited with his beloved Mandaravati and from the residence of his father's vassal where he dwells, he despatches a messenger with a letter to his old father to announce him that happy news. The messenger arrives just in time for Vahnen and his wife were preparing to enter the fire and his oral affirmation that Sundarasena is alive and will soon come back to his parents changes their despair into joy. Then he delivers his letter

ity udrya ca tasyaita rajal pidmūke nyadlat

lekhan sa Bhilabhipitalalalero laian cucam

So D whose text restore the genuine wording B₁ has *ralal cucul* a corruption which embarrassed Iwano who made of *ralal* the best he could (II 381) and pretermitted *cucul*. That the messenger spoke his comforting words not in secret but aloud is plain from the sequel (cl 309) then all the people there being delighted raised a shout of joy.

- 102 29 Br *Anutaryena tatl lalica brahmacarya*

D *Anutaryena tatl lalicasabrahmacarya*

That D is right not Br is plain by the comparison of 70 19 where it is narrated that the king of the Kuatis had been a fellow student of Vrakadatta (*śilabrahmacari*

vidyusu sa ca bulasuhra mama says M (ibid) F (II 389 line 1) was deceived by B's text

- 63 1 II 390 — see his note — follows in his translation one of his MSS which has *matsyanyu yabhayodayut* for the nonsense which is in B's text *matsaryajablayodayut* D reads *matsjanyujablayud ayan* (*virajacabdah*)

- 113 In B the first word *yuktan* is suspect I (II 393) renders it with *assembled* he construes it with *uripatin* in the 4th padā, and translates those assembled kings But nobody I suppose, would translate this from English into Sanskrit by *tin uripatin yuktin* Either Brockhaus found a bad reading in his MSS or misread the good one D has *muk tamrgamadau* etc Durgapiscer honoured his royal guests with *pearls* *muk* etc

- 103 13 In B this śloka is made up of a sentence without main predicate *praviṣya* and *tanubaddhaḥ* are predicative attributes of *Ugrakadatta* neither of them can be the predicate D restores the predicate lost in B It has *Gauryagurucramam gataḥ* (went to the sanctuary of Gauri) whereas B reads *Gauryagurucramagataḥ* (in the front of the s. of G)

- 109 Here D replaces *asadyena* the first word of the śloka in B by *aśitthyena* and thus renders to the word of Çrutiḍhi their full weight For it is for this reason that Çrutiḍhi advises Mrgakadatta to act upon the invitation of Karmasena because *it cannot be with an evasions purpose that he sent you this message other wise how would a powerful prince like that when his daughter had been carried off give up fighting and go home?* Cp I II 402 who paraphrases *asadyena* by *because he saw no other way out of the difficulty* but I scarcely believe that *asadyena* can be used as equivalent to *asadyataya*

- 101 88 In the description of the lake Çukhahrida where it is developed how charming this lake was by the scents and perfumes imparted to its waves from the women who bathed in it D's text

vicistatā jarmirastajaglanastanavandanaḥ

seems more appropriate than B's *jaralana-sthalaḥ a dalaḥ*

- D 195 = Br 196 Better than in Br where *t lra yidre* looks suspect, the composition of the period appears in D In

*nayapi tvatrite dukkham anubhutam suduhsakam
yadrçam yadipi caisu prapancaracanu Vidheh
rakshyami istatāt tat te etc*

106 41

na induh kslipati kim dalam parikshine i ka mandale?

nenduh ksepati lum kalam pariksa no rhamandale?

Does not the moon, when he is in a state of weakness spend some time within the *umbra* of the sun? So the compulsion receives its full light. *Nai vidmadatta* at this point of the story, is in a state of want of power which is analogous to the want of lustre of the moon,

when it is new As the moon resides with the sun, to await his time and to regain his strength, so N is to reside at Çrivastī with king Prasenjit where he may be said *lalam kseptum* Somadeva apparently plays with the double meaning of *mandala* 1 circle and 2 territory or sphere of power and of *lalam kseptum* which is not only = 'to delay' but also 'to await one's proper time'

- 69 Br *praçamsanti*, D *praçamsanti* I think, D is right not Bī 'The female apparition, who awakes Nāravahandatta at night time to remind him of his beloved Madanamañcukī speaks thus

*anyasat tam praçamsanti patim Madanamañcukē
hu hatasī'*

alas! Madanamañcukā, you are undone! For you pursue a husband who is attached to other women With *praçamsanti* cp 77 *śadgunākalāpinīm*

- 118 Br's text of the line 118 a and b

eram uktas taya patnya sadlyakalanurodhan
demands from the part of the interpreter a so great connivance at grammatical and lexicological incongruities — *sadhya* for *sadhayitva* and supposed to mean recognising the fact (Γ II 437) *akalanurodha* is inexplicable for sound exegesis — that D's variant must necessarily be acknowledged as representing the hand of Somadeva D reads thus

*eram uktas taya patnya sadlyakalanurodhan
Naravahanadatto tla santayan sa jagada tam*

When N had been thus addressed by his faithful wife he taking account of the present circumstances said to her by way of calming her The italics denote my modification of D's translation

108, 68

D *asu* though it changes the meaning of the hermit's words but slightly, is preferable to Br *anu* inasmuch as it improves the diction for it adds to the word indicative of the woman whose clothes are to be carried off the necessary demonstration of the group to which she belongs

82

I in his note on II 454, treats of this śloka, which is obviously corrupt in Bī and communicates a much better reading which he found in the Sanskrit College MS (*supra*, p 63), and which he followed accordingly in his translation D fully agrees, with the exception of *yaç ca*

in pāda c, for which it has *yac ca* 'This is, in fact, the right reading, as will be plain to him who reads the whole śloka as follows

*sacandrārdhah Ćiva 'dyāpi Harir yacca sakauṣṭubhah
tat tayoṃ vedmī kuttanyū gocarūpatane phalam*

= „That Ćiva still retains his crescent and Viṣṇu his kauṣṭubha jewel, *they have to thank for it, I am sure, that they did not fall into the clutches of a kuttanī*” The italics show my modification

- 88 Bī **prāptam mām ripuna tadā*, but D *prāṣṭam mām* etc. As Hariṣekhā has been thrown on the earth, the participle *prāptam* seems to be rather improper to the situation. T (II, 451) translates „when I was seized by my enemy”, rather, I think, to make something not too absurd of it, than because he held *prapta* for equivalent to „being seized”

- 132 Two Vidyādhars of the party of Naravāhanadatta come into his audience hall to inform him of the imminent attack of his foe Mandaradevī. At this news, the whole assembly are filled with anger, and the poet describes the tokens of its outburst which showed themselves in the gestures and movements of the different chieftains. So it is said of Amitagatī that his „necklace, rising up on his breast as he sighed with anger, seemed to cry again and again: Rouse thyself, rouse thyself, hero” (T II, 456). In the original text of Br

hāro 'mitagater vakshasy utphullah śaśataḥ kṛdhā,

“*uttīṣṭha 'uttīṣṭha, eva tām' iti na mukhe abravīt,*

the rising up of the necklace is expressed by the participle of the past *utphullah*. But neither a past participle is here required but a present, nor has *utphulla* another sphere of employment but to signify wide opened objects, as expanded flowers, eyes etc. For this reason, it is plain that D's reading *utphalati* for *utphullah* is a good correction. As to *utphalati* = „to jump” cp PWK IV, 200 s. v. *phal* + *ut* and the \tilde{x} -acc. *utphāla* Kathīs 26, 20

- 110, 37 In the words of the precept by which the five princesses oblige themselves, that if one among them were to marry Naravāhanadatta alone the other four should enter the fire, laying the guilt at the door of her who was wedded (T II, 471), the apodosis (Br)

uddheya tām ātmā tyaktavyo 'nyabhir aṣṭa ite

contains the impossible turn *tyaktavyo 'stu*, I do not wonder at D reading *āstv iti* instead of *astv iti*!

- 75 The second line of this śloka is made up of one of the absolute locatives descriptive of the *mise en scène* of Naravāhanadatt's *abhīṣeka*. In Br it runs thus

samgatya tīrṇya-nādeshu mukhareshu dyuyoshitām
= „and the assembled cymbals of the heavenly nymphs resounded aloud” (T II, 473) The use of the absolutive *samgatya* is rather strange in this connection, a participle in *°ta* would be more rational. Yet *samgata* would scarcely make a plausible correction. Brockhaus in fact, may have misread his *Forlag*. D has *mangalya* for *samgatya* and in some kinds of writing मंगल्य and संगल्य are very similar to each other. The whole line in D is

mangalyaturyanādesu sugiteṣu dyuyoshitām
„at the beautiful songs of the heavenly nymphs accompanied by the auspicious sound of the (heavenly) musical instruments”

- 130 Brockhaus supposes a lacuna after this śloka (cp T II, 476), for this reason, I believe, because *usanne kopakāle 'pi*, the first words of the śloka, seem to preclude the mention of an instant quarrel or a „period of quarrelling”, as I translates it, which however is no more spoken of in the sequel. Durgaprasād firstly states that the good reading is *usanna kopakāle*, and in a note at this śloka (p. 524 of the 2^d ed.) he remarks that this is to be divided into *usann akopakāle*. He is right. The meaning is „The wives of Naravāhanadatt, though there was no opportunity then of being angry, had nevertheless contracted eye-brows and heavy eyes — for they were tipsy.” This is followed by the statement, that they went to another room to take their meal, etc. There is no gap.

- III, 77 A slight variant or rather the misreading of one akṣara comes to the detriment of the wit of Udayana when, being on the point of leaving Kauṣāmbī to become a *vanaprastha*, he rebukes his brother-in-law by a denial of the permission to be his companion in the forest. Feigning to be angry at Gopīśaka's disobedience to his order to reign in his place, he exclaims
- adyana tvaṁ anāyatto jato mithyānūrtta me
śrapadūc cyaṁamūnasya kasyajñām ko hi manyate?*

So D whereas in Br the first line ends thus *mithy anuvrttaye* Udr̥ama says 'lo dry you have become disobedient showing your affection to me a sham for who cares for the command of one who is falling from his place of power?' I have put italics, where I alter the translation of T

81 Some lines below, D has *Gopulako vah pateti* (Br — *pāti iti*) a better reading for the future, especially that in °tr he shall — is here the ten e required

113 115 D has *anyanya* for Br *anyonya* and so both times, in the first and in the third pada, confirming T's conjecture, cp his note 2 on II 520

116, 69 The decisive single combat of Muktapahlaketu and Vidyuddhvaja took place on the 25th day of the great battle. In B's text it may seem that this duel happened after sunset for it is edited there

*pañcaviṃśe dine kṣīṇe prayayoḥ saṁnyayoḥ diayoḥ
pradhana diandīyuddhesu pravitteṣu atra saṁgare*
I (II 527) render this śloka. And *at the end of the twenty fifth day* a series of single combats was taking place between the principal warriors of both armies *along the greater part of the line of the fight*. I have italicized the translation of both *pañcaviṃśe dine kṣīṇe* and *prayayoḥ saṁnyayoḥ diayoḥ*. The former may perhaps be accounted for however improbable it is but the latter is nothing but a desperate effort to draw forth something acceptable from a phrase which defies sound philological interpretation. In D both difficulties cease to exist for there we read

pañcaviṃśe dine kṣīṇaprayayoḥ saṁnyayoḥ diayoḥ etc
= on the twenty fifth day when the two armies were almost exhausted

79 Muktapahlaketu who fights on the side of the Devas has vanquished and killed the Asura Vidyuddhvaja (76—78). Thereupon the Devas shout for joy and pour showers of flowers on the hero as usual in such cases. According to Br they did so from Svarga — *Devāḥ svargād anupadān jagadāḥ siddhau siddhau ite* — but how could they being excluded at that time from heaven and waiting for the victory of their champion to be reinstated in their seats? For this reason I think D is right, reading the line quoted as follows *devāḥ ca*

nadanupadam etc the Devas, immediately after (hearing) the noise (of the fall of the Asura slain by M) cried etc" Cp Raghuv 1, 14

7, 31

Princess Padmavatī has fallen in love with Mukta-phalaketu and has painted her sweetheart. She addresses the picture with a pathetic declaration of her love, beginning thus — in 'I's translation, II, 530 — When thou didst slay the formidable Asura and deliver India how comes it that thou doest not deliver me from my woe though near me by speaking to me at my rate? As I rests on Br's text, he must have added out of his own the words 'from my woe', for they do not occur in B1

durjayān Asurān hatvā yena 'Indro rakshitas tvaṃ,
ālāpamātreṇa sa mām katham ārād na rakṣasi?

In D the first line is identical, the second shows a slight variant which, however, entails a considerable change of meaning

ālāpamātreṇa sa mām katham Māraṇ na rakṣasi

how comes it that thou doest not protect me from the God of Love were it only by speaking to me? Māra = Kuma Cp the parallel passages cl 50 *idam cetō notsalate kṣanam / sthatum ima tarī prañeṣam kṣamate na ca Man mathah* and 65 *strighnena hanyamunam rakṣasi mām Makaraketunu na katham*

51

Cl 51 which is put of the utterance of Padmavatī and is closely connected with the preceding śloka just quoted presents a remarkable variance of reading in the two editions. In Br it runs thus

tam eva hi smarantya me mano nirvati tatkṣanam
dahyante ngm samtapena utkrāṃanti u ca usatah

but in D

tam eva hi smarantya me mano nirvati na kṣanam etc

At the first aspect it will seem that the reading of the one conveys a meaning quite opposite to that of the other. And so it is. The verb *nirvati* must have that signification of quiet gladness, which it has got in consequence of the contamination of the derivatives of *ni* + *ir* and *ni* + *ia*, as known from Pali *nibbata* and *nibbanam* so I suppose the meaning 3) of PW s v *ia* + *ni* (VI, 376) gets its genetic basis. According to Br therefore, the sensation described in the first line is one of pleasure,

but those mentioned in the third and fourth pāda are disagreeable sensations, but in D all are tainted with the guna of *rajas*, so to speak. Not only the absence of the adversative particle, which should be indispensable in Br's text, is a formal argument for D, but it is also not consistent that a woman in the situation of Padmāvatī should speak as is thus rendered by T (II, 531) „For when I think of him, my mind is immediately refreshed,” — if translated literally, it should be „is immediately made quiet and put in calm rejoicing.” The fire of passion, not the calmness of dispassionate joy [*mr̥ṛti* cp *mr̥ṛta bhava* cf 62 = „be comforted” apud T (II, 532)] is kindled by her thinking of the man whom she loves vehemently, without knowing anything about his feelings towards herself. D's text conveys a more appropriate sense, „For when I think of him, *my mind is quite troubled*, my limbs burn and my breath seems to leave my body with glowing heat.”

- 90 Padmāvatī has come near the place, where Mukṭāphalaketu lies ill. T II, 533 „she said to herself, Let me see what his illness is, that he is lying here concealed.” The last word renders *channasyana* of Br. But as there is no reason at all to say that M is concealed (*channa*), still less to emphasize this by means of the particle *eva*, it is clear that D's reading *channasthāva* imports a by far more satisfactory meaning. It is she who spies from her hiding place the facts and sayings of Mukṭāphalaketu and his friend.

- 118, 18 Somadeva relates how Merudhva was in the habit of assisting, at the assembly of the gods on the day of the full moon in the month of Caitra (T II, 539). As this assembly met once a year, D's reading *vatsarāmbhe* for Br's *vāsarāmbhe* is right. To correct „for Merudhva always went up to Śakra's hall at new year.”

- 67 It is related how the Dātyas fight a battle with an army of men, the Dātyas standing in the air and the men on the earth. It need no further proof to demonstrate that not Br *Dātyās tu mānushān svak sthāh bhūtala sthān babādhire*, but D *Dātyas* *l ha sthā bhūtala sthan* etc. is the genuine reading. The Dātyas are represented standing not in the heaven, but between heaven and earth. T (II, 542) rendered the line duly, notwithstanding Br's false

reading I think, Blochhaus misread the akṣura ल, cp *supra*, p 69 in fine

- 119 152 foll In this point of the tale of Mukṭaphalādhvaja and Padmīvatī their reunion after separation — a common place in love stories of that kind — is being prepared Mukṭaphalādhvaja has come to the temple of Śiva where Padmīvatī being invisible to him, perceives him He entered and seeing that offerings had been recently placed in front of the god prince Mukṭaphalādhvaja said to that companion of his 'Look my friend, some one has been quite recently worshipping this symbol of the god surely, that beloved of mine must be somewhere there and she must have done this worship' (I II, 557) The variance of both editions is only this that in cl 152 B₁ reads *devo D devam* and in 153 B₁ *arcito naya D arcitas taya* Yet though the latter variance is rather indifferent the former necessitates a whole change of construction For D's text requires this interpunction

so 'pr praviṣya devagram dr̥ṣṭva pratyagrapuṣṭatā
Mukṭaphalādhvajo devam iayasyam tatā abhāṣata

= Mukṭaphalādhvaja came in to the god and seeing that the god had been worshipped recently (by offerings) he said etc D presents here a text of more elegant expression and I greatly doubt whether *Mukṭaphalādhvajo devah* = prince M can be tolerated in this style As to *praviṣya devagram* cp 26 96

- 206 Padā b of this indravamṣī stanza has been corrected from MSS by I see his note on II 560 which correction is confirmed by D but p da d which concludes thus *vidhvat sa blutunā* (B₁) = that prosperous (king of the Gandhāras) with due rites in I's translation cannot be faultless since *sa* having already found its place in pāda c (*pradāt sa Mukṭaphalaketāve sutam*) is here superfluous D reads *vidhvat viblutunā*, changing the prosperous king into a wealthy one

- 120 67 For *ujadinā* (Br) we find in D *upamānam* This makes a quite different meaning Vikramāditya is highly praised and according to Br it is said of him in T's translation (II 567) Surely his glory furnished the Di-po er [= *Idli*] with the material out of which he built

up the White Island [*Āretadvīpa*], the Sea of Milk, Mount Kailāsa and the Himālayas" Conceding ever so much to the habits of exaggeration and anachronism, which are proper to Eastern poetry, it is hard to set to the credit of an Indian poet that he should be supposed to make his readers accept such an enormity as the Sea of Milk and the Himālaya created after the pattern of King Vikramāditya's glory D's text conveys something more reasonable According to it, the Creator or Dispenser (*Vidhi*) surely used the *Āretadvīpa*, the Sea of Milk etc as his model, when he brought V's glory into being

- 76 In the enumeration of the countries conquered by Vikramaçakti for his master Vikramāditya B1 names these

Madhyadeśah sa-Saurāṣṭrah, sarvā Gāṅgā ca pūrvaḥ, which implies a very uncommon manner to express, all the eastern region of the Ganges', as T (II, 567) renders it, or „the whole eastern region, where the Ganges flows" as may rather be meant by *Gaṅgā pūrvāḥ* (!) In D there is no question of the Ganges, which in fact does not specially belong to the eastern region of India These countries subdued are named there

Madhyadeśah sa-Saurāṣṭrah sa Vāṅgāṅgā ca pūrvāḥ = „ and the eastern region with the land of Vāṅga and Anga (that is with Bengal)

- 83 A slight, but necessary correction of Br is D's text
ito devāṅgāyā deva gataham praptavān kramat
The vocative *deva* is here as properly put as *cana* (the reading of Br) is unaccountable and, therefore, passed over by T (II, 568)

- 121, 95 In the course of the ludicrous story of the gamester Thinhthakarala Somadeva gives vent to this remark, that even gods avoid the contact with an impudent scoundrel, as if they were incapable to withstand him The śloka which contains this saying, is corrupt in Br

*akṣhina bhogād viśhamād dṛiṣṭvā tato 'bhayaṅgatāt
durjanād iata devā apy açaktā na bibhyati*

In T's translation (II, 576) this is rendered somewhat obscurely „Even gods, you see, like feeble persons, are afraid of a thoroughly self-indulgent [= *akṣinabhogāt*], ruffianly scoundrel [= *viśhamād durjanāt*], flushed with impunity [= *abhayaṅgatāt*]" Here the last epithet is

strange, for his impunity presupposes at all events the consequence of this attitude of the gods, not the source of it, *akṣinabhoga* cannot signify that which T has put for it, and finally *dr̥ṣṭvā* is not translated at all (for „you see” must be the equivalent, I suppose, of *bata*) and, in fact, in this connection cannot be accounted for. D's edition restores the genuine text

*akṣinadoṣād viṣamād iṣṭāniṣṭabhaḥyojjhātāt
durjanād bata devā apy aśaktā na bibhṛat*

= „Even gods, you see, as if they were incapable to withstand him, are afraid of an utterly perverted and wicked scoundrel who fearless does not at all care for good or evil (in his actions)”

155 sq

‘*Thmthākārāla*, in order to make the king demolish the temple and by this to get free his wife, „secretly buried in a forest outside the city four pitchers containing his wife's ornaments” (T II, 579)

(B) *latra 'ataiyām catasīṣhu nyadhād dīkṣhu purād iahīh
kūntālamhūā-kalacān mārīya caturo bhūi*

In T's translation I find no equivalent for *mārīya* nor should I know what meaning to give to this gerund in this context. Instead of it D has *nīkḥāya*, the very word we are in want of, *nyadhād nīkḥāya* together = „he buried”. The following half śloka runs thus in B:

pañcapañca-maharatna sampūṇam makhāna sah

„and one full of sets of the five precious things, he buried within the city etc.” So T, who in a note accounts for the term ‘five precious things’. In D, however, we read

pañcamam ca maharatnasampurnam makhāna sah

= „and the fifth (pitcher), filled up with precious jewels he buried etc.” That all five pitchers contained rich ornaments and no difference is made between them, is plain from the sequel, see § 162, 167 and 171

180

(B) *tac carīṇa cet kṛtyam tava, anilocya tad, nripa,
adyaua 'tad dīṭam devakulam bhūmi-samam kuru'*

„So, if you care for your body's well, my sovereign, take this into consideration and this very day quickly level this temple with the earth” (T II, 580). For *anilocya* D has *nīlothyā*, a reading more appropriate

to the facts. How can there be time for consideration, if the temple should be demolished this very day? Thinthākarīla says „If you desire to live, demolish the temple and level it with the earth quickly, even this very day.” *Nirlothayati* „to demolish” is also used by Somadeva 76, 30 *nirlothya mathikām*, answering to T II 244 „remove this hut and —”

- 122, 21 Br *sa dvy akena tiy akena 'asmai rājñe prābhṛita putrikām
likhita 'anyānyayā rūpa bhāngyā citrakaro dadau*

It suffices to observe that D reads *dvy akena dvy akena*, to understand that this variance is really an emendation of Br. So both the symmetry of the composition (cp *anyānyayā* in pāda c) and the rules of grammar concerning the *vīpsā* have got their due.

- 63 Vikramāditya, so it is related, had a pleasant dream, that in a very beautiful city across the sea he met with a charming lady, the man-hating princess Malayāvatī and married her. When he awoke not perceiving her he grew sad, and time going he became so afflicted that he lost his interest in everything. His door-keeper Bhadrāyudha, having heard in private the secret cause of his sorrow, induces him to paint the whole scene of his dreamed happiness on a canvass. This being done, Bhadrāyudha had a new monastery made and the picture put up there on the wall. „And he directed that in relief houses attached to the monastery, a quantity of food, with pairs of garments and gold, should be given to birds come from distant countries” (T II, 590). The sentence I have placed within signs of quotation is the translation of this *śloka* in Br's text

*mathe ca 'atra 'akarod dūra deśāgantuka landinām
satreshv anna-samāhāram sa vastrayuga-kāñcanam*

In D it is not „relief houses” from which he orders to take the presents destined to the birds, but one such a building, on the other hand, the food is qualified to be delicate, having the six (required) flavours. The pāda c reads in D *sattre śadrasam āhāram*

- 123, 196 The boatmen, bribed by the old brahmin, push the boat where Keçata was into a place of the river where the current ran strong and, swimming themselves ashore, leave him alone to be carried to the sea. His reaching the sea is narrated in this manner in Br

*Keçatas tu sanauko 'pi nadyā kṛitottarangayā
kṣipto 'mbudhan vātaragāt*

= „But K was carried with the boat, by the river
which was lashed into waves by the wind, into the sea”
(T II, 603) D has

Keçatas tu sanauko 'pi nadyā kṛitottarangayā etc
„K carried away with the boat by the river which
ran with high waves by the wind, was pushed into
the sea”

CHAPTER III

CONJECTURAL CRITICISM

It has been sufficiently proved, I think in the Chapters I and II that the edition of Durgaprasad marks a considerable progress. We are filled with gratefulness towards that *upakarīn*, whose labours contributed so much to the better understanding of the important text on which he bestowed his care and Fawcay must feel somewhat sorry I think that D's edition was not out at the time when he made his translation. Nevertheless as has also been stated above it is no critical edition. Though the tradition of the text is upon the whole a good one so that the number of troublesome or difficult passages owing to corruption and deprivation of the author's words is comparatively small yet such puzzles are not wanting altogether. In such cases the absence of an apparatus criticus makes itself painfully felt. The actual state of what is really found in manuscripts is hidden in a dark *terra incognita*. The only and scanty light that sparingly illuminates small spots of it is emitted by the apparatus of Fawcay in those cases where his translation is not based on Br's text but on different readings of the manuscripts at his disposal. It is something encouraging that his corrections of that kind often confirm conjectural emendations previously proposed by scholars.

For it is a matter of course that considering at one side our ignorance of the *lectionis varietas* in the manuscripts at the other the insufficient *ars et ratio* of Br's conjectural criticism is sometimes by necessity to be resorted to. Some competent Sanskritists whom some reason or other caused to attend more closely to the outer form and the elocution of the Ocean of the Streams of Tales did good work in that direction. First of all BOURNASSIE was obliged to ponder Br's text for the wants of his Dictionary and FAWCAY had to fulfil this task as a cautious and judicious translator. Both proposed many conjectures *de x o* among which excellent corrections. After the appearance of Br's volume III (Jamb

IX—XVIII) KERN published a paper in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1868 containing a list of conjectural emendations.

A very great number of them are incorporated in D's text. I dare not say that they have found their way thither. I hold it for more likely that they happened to agree with the readings of his new manuscripts and from thence passed into his text. However this may be the good right and the utility of conjectural criticism as *ultimum remedium* is once more attested.

Boehlingk's corrections are dispersed in the Petropolitan Dictionary for this reason I give some fuller indication of those which agree with D's text as far as I have noted them. At 55 165 *śaṃpikāṇaḥ* for *śaṃyā*° 56 217 *śabhyā* for *śatyā* 62 188 *anokāla* for *anai*° 68 11 *udgātāt* for *udhā*° 68 37 *śaṃvāra* for *śaṃvāra* 72 20 *vandakā* for *ī rakā* 80 30 *śaṃvāra* for *śaṃ*° 98 5 *vandakā* for *ī*° 103 30 *śaṃvāra* for *śaṃ*° 118 112 and 120 25 *dhīya* for *dhīṣṭhā* and *dhīṣṭhā* (sic) 120 39 *vaiśaṃyātā* for *vaiśaṃyātā* 120 123 *gandhāra* for *Gandhāra* 122 67 *parivāṣṭya* for *paula*°

Conjectures of Lawney confirmed by D are found 6 19 12 108 13 147 15 1 20 122 35 129 68 50 70 100 123 72 366 73 134 78 23 87 11 92 86 93 67 94 106 110 115 122 139 123 294

Conjectures of Kern similarly confirmed 5 103 56 70 57 66 60 10 63 185 61 218 66 35 72 86 81 102 86 111 90 33 91 119 101 31 156 102 113 103 64 93 104 160 107 25 30 38 112 161 113 18 117 16 120 62 121 107 122 8 123 158 121 128

Sometimes but rarely conjectural emendations not confirmed by D agree with one or more of Lawney's MSS. e.g. Kern's proposal as to 114 113

Pandit Mookerjya mended 55 181 (see I I 146) which emendation has been confirmed by D. Similarly that of an anonymous scholar as to 29 150 (*vai* for *balī* vid supra p 109)

The following striking corrections are not warranted by D's text. Of Lawney with respect to 22 238 21 181 (180) 20 117 216 40 167 17 117 of Kern as to 32 189 60 218 106 178 of Boehlingk as to 73 240 (*ca* for *cira* cp 87 32 where the same correction agrees with D) 70 76 (*ast* for *ast*) Yet I would not at a moment hesitate to take them up into the text if ever I were to perform a critical edition of the Kathasaritsaṃgāra.

Now I proceed to some proposals of conjectural criticism for my own part. I accept one passage treated in Ch II (*supra* p 120)

where I could not avoid it for a practical reason, I have hitherto abstained from bringing forth my own guesses about corruptions of the text without the support of manuscript readings. In this way the conjectural proposals after the publication of D will stay apart from those made before that time on the sole text of Br.

6, 108 I begin with correcting a slight error in a name. In Br 6, 108 *Devākrtam tad udyānam* must be changed into *Devākrtim* etc, cp ibid 72 *Devakrtir iti khyātam udyānam* etc

111 In this śloka both Br. and D have *jahnuk*, an impossible form. Brockhaus translates this perfect by „schlagen (auf ihn) zu“, hence Tawney likewise „pelted him vigorously“ (I, 37), as if it were *jaghnuk*. I read *jahruk*, this verb agrees better, I suppose, with the adjectives qualifying its subject. The bathing wives „with bodies the proportions of which were revealed by their clinging garments“ incited the mind of their husband to lovesport, *jahruk tam anganah* = „mulieres cum ceperunt“

119 Some lines below it is related how the king was wholly abashed at the manifestation of his ignorance of Sanskrit appearing by his misunderstanding the words of the queen „*modakair deṣa paritūdaya mam*“ „The king was at once overpowered with secret shame“ (*layjakranto jhatity abhūt* cf 118). Cf 119 thus proceeds

parityaktajalakrīdo vidadarpaśca tatkṣanam

jātānamūno nirlakṣaḥ prāvīṣan nīyamandaram,

so D. In Br. is edited *nirlakṣyah*, LAMMAN has adopted this reading in his *Reader*, 50¹⁴. But neither *nirlakṣaḥ* nor *nirlakṣyah* seem to represent the genuine word. If we admit of its correctness, we have to comply with such an *ṛ-ṛṣ* *εἰςμεῖς* as is scarcely consistent with the general laws of structure of Sanskrit words. There does not exist such a verb as *nirlakṣayati*, if it existed, it would not at any rate mean „to avoid the sight“. On the other hand, analyzing *nirlakṣya* (or **laka*) = „where the *lakṣya* is wanting“ cannot account for the translation neither of Br., who makes the king return to his palace, „um von Niemandem gesehen zu werden,“ nor for that of T., who renders the conclusion of this śloka in this manner „and immediately entered his own palace unperceived“. The simplest correction would be to change *nirlakṣaḥ* into *vilakṣaḥ*. But it

seems improbable that an as common word as *vilakṣa* should have been altered. If we correct *niralakṣmi* all will be right. *Lakṣmi* has often the meaning of 'brilliance, lustre' in one's outer appearance (cp. Apṭh's Dict., s. v. 1°). *niralakṣmi* is the same as the more common word *nispṛabha*. The king, being abashed and put to shame, was in low spirits and in a dejected state of mind; this he showed by his perplexed countenance. Cp. the parallel places *Divyāvadāna* 633° and *Avadanaśataka* I 48¹⁰ where *nispṛatibhāna* is used of persons, vanquished in disputation.

- 9 77 For *vipanne pannage purāṇa* I read *v p purāṇe*. The mountaineer says to Udayana: 'I am a poor man, and I always maintain myself by exhibiting snakes [*gṛāṇa bhujagam Malayāṇ sadu*]. The snake I previously had having died I finding this one captured him [*ayam maya labdhah*] (I I 55). Now as the phrase 'the snake I previously had' corresponds to *pannagal purāṇa* not *purāṇa*, it follows that *purāṇa* is a corrupt reading and must be corrected into *purāṇe*.
- 10 159 The hunter who finds Çiḍatta and tells him that his wife whom he had lost is safe and stays at Nagasthala in the house of an old brahman concludes his message with this *śloka* which is edited (in both B and D) as follows:
*tataḥ ca lam iliyato buddhiḥ tvannāna tanmukhat
 tvaṇ aneṣṭum tato gaccha śighram Nagasthalaṇ prati*
 T (I 64) renders the second line thus: 'Therefore you had better go quickly to N to search for her.' But how can Çiḍatta be urged to search for his wife when he has been just before informed of the place where she is? The right reading is, of course, *tvann aneṣṭum* with punctuation after these words for it is *aham ilagataḥ* that has *tvann aneṣṭum* for its complement. The hunter says: 'having learnt your name from her lips I came here to search after you. Therefore, go quickly to N.'
- 11 77 *tataḥ kilena jātisya rajnah kanya tu tanvy alla*
 The particle *tu* is here not required and inconvenient. Correct *sutanvy alla* = 'a very delicate daughter or a beautiful daughter.'
- 13 196 Vā-avadatta leaves her uneasiness at her having left stealthily the paternal home with her lover, king Udayana,

being moved by the lovely tale narrated by Vasantaka about the adventures of the faithful wife Devasmitā. These are the contents of this śāṇḍilyakīrṇita stanza, the third and fourth pādas of which are thus edited

tallajūsadanam vidhaya vidadhe Vāseṣare bhartari

prakṛaudhapranayāt abaddham apī tad bhaktyekatanam manah

The subject of the passive perf *vidadhe* is *Vāsavadattayā* in the second pīda 'Tawney has well 'caught, I think, the purport of the first part of pīda c), which Brockhaus must have considered so difficult as to overlook it wholly in his translation. He translates „she got over the feeling of shame [= *tallajūs vidhāya*] at having recently left her father's house [= *navaparityakte pitur veṣmani* in pīda b)]'. Apparently he does not take *sadanam* = 'Sitz', as is done PW VII, 603 s. v. *sadana* 1), but he will claim for it the meaning 3) 'Erschlaffung', as I do. Yet, this being the case, its connection with *vidhāya* does not make a proper sense. Not *vidhāya* but *viḥāya* must be the right reading, *tallajūsadanam viḥāya* answers to Latin *hujus pudoris languore relicto*.

11, 15 The nuptials of Udayana and Vāsavadattā are come to an end, and U with his wife go back to Kauṣāmbī
sa pratasthe tato deṣya saha śrapurim prātī. After two or three days *viṣayam tam avāpya sah* etc. Correct *viṣayam śīlam*, for he arrived in his own territory.

100 Both B₁ and D have *gacchat dvantikam brūtha*. For *brūtha* to restore *brūtī*, it is an imperative.

17, 72 I change *pramodena* into *pramūdēna*. Somaprabhā, that wondrous girl, who spoke immediately after birth, had told her father, he must not marry her to anybody, accordingly the father „concealed her in his house”, and in this manner she grew up hidden from everybody. But, so relates our tale teller, once it happened that on the festival of spring she looked down from the top of her house. That she did so *pramūdēna* 'by some imprudence (of her warden-)' is something essential which cannot be missing, *pramodena*, which denotes that „she looked on out of gladness”, is to no purpose. Even in the parallel extract in *Bīhaṭkathāmanjari*, however shortened, the accidental character of the fact is indicated, see p. 80, cl. 139 *tam ṣakroṣṣayātrayām daivād vātanasthitam / Guhasenasuto 'pacyat*.

- 156 Yaugandharīyana counsels his master to return to Kauṣṭhī, for we know that there is nothing to be feared from the king of Magadha even though he has been deceived for he has been completely gained over by means of the negotiation termed 'Giving of a daughter' (I I, 123) Here the sentence he has been gained over is the translation of *samadhīta* in B₁, an impossible form explained in PW, VII 102 as an *as* *as* = *samdhita* D reads *sa budhīta* (= he has been checked') The true reading is, of course, *sa sādhitā*, that expresses nearly the same as I s 'he has been gained over', the whole line runs thus

- 21, 96 *kanyasambandhanamna hi samna samyag sa sadhīta*
It is almost superfluous to observe that the avagraha in both editions should disappear *sa rajaputro bheje*
parāṃ śrīyam Cp *supra* p 92 in fine

- 24, 106 I read the śloka thus
tanu ca sa dūṣiṣṭo sya sakṇa caranukhena tat
vijñāya Madhavo py evaṃ nagarīm praveṣa tum
The edited text has *tam* and *etan nagarīm*
2, 58 Both B₁ and D edit this śloka as follows
ratna ca tatā suplesu sarveṣu adhogatudhvasu
śrāntesv astinaparinadipinthaṣṭayyanivāsiṣu

Here I cannot account for *adhogatudhvan* as a designation of people who have travelled the whole day and are now fatigued as is required by the context I (I, 209) translates And at night while all were asleep worried with their long journey etc *Adhogatudhvan* does not suit this meaning it ought to denote rather one who has found his way I propose to correct *sarveṣu apī gatudhvasu* = while all travellers without exception, were asleep *gatudhvan* is here as appropriate a word to signify people at rest after travelling as *adhvaga* and *adhvagaṇa* (Jatakamala VI 27) to signify travellers on the road

- 217 I think *tam* at the end of the 2^d pāda is to be corrected into *tat sarovaram* is a neuter always and every where Cp PW and PWK ~ v

- 26 112 D = 140 Br The sons of Sitavratā, having had hold on Śaktideva, are going to make an expiatory offering of him to Durgā, since he had occasioned the death of their father They say

saubhāgyam and express that she possessed beauty and other qualities apt to captivate a husband. The conclusion "thanks to my mother-in-law" is a clever rendering of *śaṣṭhīprasada* of the original. Yet *prasada*, being not used as 'you', 'thanks to' as a vox media indicative of any cause, even of mishap is wholly out of place here. And the nature of the context forbids us to explain *śaṣṭhīprasada* as an ironical utterance = "by the favour [that is, ill favour] of my mother-in-law." The word is doubtless deprived. I guess the genuine ablative may be easily restored and read the śloka as follows:

*adityah patil kule janma saubhāgyam sa lūrttata
tad apy aśo mama śaṣṭhī aparasada idrī upat*

nevertheless I suffer such calamity because of that occurred mother-in-law. For *aparasada* with this meaning see the instances quoted by AIRL. *Sanskrit English Dict* 2. v. 1 and also Daśakumāracarita Uttarakh 4th

Ucchvāsa (p. 131 ed. Iman) *liṅga yasi lūyaparasada*

32 135 D = 136 B. The structure of the period which makes up this śloka is somewhat disturbed. The clause *yat sūtr me śti nāpita* is not accounted for satisfactorily from a grammatical point of view. Whether it should be construed with the preceding sentence or with the following I think *yat sūtr* should be corrected into *yah sūtr* and I read the śloka thus:

*śas tatrabyupāyāḥ syut yah sūtr me śti nāpita
idigayanaaluṣalāḥ sa cet kṛtya id ilodya m*

145 B. What may be the force of *param* the 1st word of the first line of this śloka? The female ascetic deliberates with her friend the brubhā about some means to remove queen Jādūgāhikā from king Prthivārman her husband who is much attached to her. The brubhā dissuades to use violence therefore it is far better' says he, that she should be separated from the king by the (us of our) ingenuity etc. (T. I, 266). There can be no question of doubting the rightness of this translation. But it is not *param* that means far better but, *carāra*, and so, I am sure the edited text is to be mended:

tasmad hṛdīlīlalenaisi rājno vishvate i'aram

This, too, is in accordance with the habit of our author of employing *i'aram* in the way of an adverb so as to have

almost the nature of our „rather’ Here are some instances 22, 84 *tad etām upasarpāmi tāvay jiyāsītum varam / ity ālocya*, 26, 250 *āstām tatvaiva bhūyo ’pi pāpāḥ kāpālika varam*; = „let the wicked kāpālika rather remain there still longer”, 39, 50 (Br) *tad ihava varam deva bhugrham kriyatām iti*; 101, 8 *varam Ujjayinīm yūmi tatra prāpyeta jñtu saḥ*, 123, 57 *tad gacchami varam pathā / etatpradaśyamānena* Other instances see PW, VI s v *varam*, 2 b

- 34, 167 I read this śloka with a slight correction, altering *tayāmya* into *taśyā*

tathā pārṣvam taśyāmya sūlām Madanamāñculām

Kaṅgasenayū prityā rajyamānah sa tasthivān

Pārṣvam cannot be destitute of the genitive depending on it

- 212 The words *yathā tathā* at the end of the 2^d pāda must be interchanged, the meaning being „he conducted himself in such a way [*ceṣṭate sma tathā*] that [*yathā*], though attacked by an emperor, he was not defeated’ (T I, 314)

- 37, 165 Tawney translates the line *anūbhūtādbhūtāñchajanmāmūtrava janmani* „having endured more than one [add ‘wonderful’] birth in this very life” (I, 343) But *amutra janmani* is „in the other life”, the very counterpart of this life (*īdam janma*) Somadeva wrote, I am sure, *janmāmūtre va janmani* = „having endured many wonderful births, as if in the other world”

- 38, 111 It is said of the heroine Madanamīla that she, having lost her sweetheart, determined to die, if in the space of six months he should not return Her temper of mind, while being in this disposition, is thus described in the edited text (Br and D)

*tatas tadaprayogārtā jūtam viśaredanām
deham nīphalamuyāsamāhūram caurayūtānām
manyamāna,*

and rendered by T (I, 352) as follows „. . . afflicted at his departure, and considering life to be poison agony, and the body, that fruitless accumulation of delusion, to be merely a punishment for thieving” We may understand that she, heavy with sorrow, looks on life as anguish caused by poison, but what in the world may account for the strange and absurd opinion, that the body

should be held for 'a punishment for thieving'? Besides, though *māyā* (delusion) is the acknowledged cause of the phenomenal world, from the orthodox Vedantic standpoint, such a tenet as *deha* = *māyāsamāhāra* is unheard of and, if considered well, almost an impossibility for an Indian mind, the *māyā* does not consist of small particles, the sum or *samāhāra* of which makes up a body. Brockhaus was mistaken, when he divided *nishphala māyā-samāhāram*. He ought to have divided thus *nishphalam ayusam āhāram*, in three words. And as to *caurayutanām*, I am sure it repeats a misread *carā yutanām*. I restore, accordingly, Somadeva's genuine śloka in this manner

tatas tadāpiyogūrta jivitam usavedanam

deham nishphalam āyūsam āhāram carā yutanām
manyamānā,

= " considering life to be poison agony, the body
fruitless toil and food to be a punishment "

39, 215 For *iājānam gatam buddha savakchalam* / *sambhāryana*
I propose *sva iākchalam* / *sambhāryana* = "guessing
that the king was gone after knowing her false tongue",
buddha has the king for its subject, not the queen. T's
translation (I, 366) is to be corrected in this way

41, 31 King Cīrāyus the long-lived, whose minister was the
wise Nāgarjuna (see *supra* p 48), has anointed his
son Jivahara *jivahāra*. When he rejoiced at his dignity
of crown prince, comes up to his mother she says to
him "Why do you rejoice without cause, my son at
having obtained this dignity of crown prince for this is
not a step to the attainment of the kingly dignity, not
even by the help of asceticism." For many crown princes,
sons of your father have died, and not one of them
has obtained the throne, they have all inherited disap-
pointment. For Nāgarjuna has given this king an elixir
by the help of which he is now in the eighth century
of his age." These words of the mother, which I transcribe
from T (I, 377) = original text II, 31—33, offer no
difficulty, but for the mention of asceticism. The life and
the business of a crown prince are the very contrary of
the life and the occupations of an ascetic. What, then,
the *tapas* has to do here? Nothing at all, I think. If the
free from co on, that *tapas* would cease
arm of this śloka was

almost the nature of our „rather” Here are some instances 22, 84 *tad etāṃ upasarpāmi tūcay jijñāsitum iaram / ity ālocya*, 26, 250 *āstām tatraiva bhūyo, 'pa pūpak kṛpāliko iaram;= „let the wicked kṛpālika rather remain there still longer”, 39, 50, (Br) tad ihaiva iaram deṃ bhugrham kṛiyatām iti*, 101, 8 *iaram Ujjayinīm yām tatra prūpyeta jatu sah*, 123, 57 *tad gaccham iaram pathā / etatpradarśyamāneva* Other instances see PW, VI s v *iaram*, 2 b

- 34, 167 I read this śloka with a slight correction, altering *tayāniya* into *tas yā*^o

tatra pārṇvam tasyāniya sutam Madanamamācukām

Kalingasenayū pritya iayamānah sa tathivān

Pārṇvam cannot be destitute of the genitive depending on it

- 212 The words *yathu tathu* at the end of the 2^d pāda must be interchanged, the meaning being „he conducted himself in such a way [*ceṣṭate sma tathā*] that [*yathā*], though attacked by an emperor, he was not defeated’ (T I, 314)

- 37, 165 Tawney translates the line *anubhūtādbhutanekajanmāmūtrava janmani*, having endured more than one [add ‘wonderful’] birth in this very life” (I, 343) But *amutra janmani* is „in the other life”, the very counterpart of this life (*īdam janma*) Somadeva wrote, I am sure, *janmāmūtre va janmani = „having endured many wonderful births, as if in the other world”*

- 38, 111 It is said of the hetēra Madanamālā that she, having lost her sweetheart, determined to die, if in the space of six months he should not return Her temper of mind, while being in this disposition, is thus described in the edited text (Br and D)

lataś tadviprayogātā jvītam vivādanūm

deham nīphalamāyusamāhāram caurayutanūm

manyamāna,

and rendered by T (I, 352) as follows „afflicted at his departure, and considering life to be poison agony, and the body, that fruitless accumulation of delusion, to be merely a punishment for thieving” We may understand that she, heavy with sorrow, looks on life as an anguish caused by poison, but what in the world may account for the strange and absurd opinion, that the body

should be 'hold for 'a punishment for thieving'? Besides, though *māyā* (delusion) is the acknowledged cause of the phenomenal world, from the orthodox Vedantic standpoint, such a tenet as *deha* = *māyasaṁhāra* is unheard of and, if considered well, almost an impossibility for an Indian mind, the *māyā* does not consist of small particules, the sum or *saṁhāra* of which makes up a body. Brockhaus was mistaken, when he divided *nishphala māyā saṁhāram*. He ought to have divided thus *nishphalam āyāsam āhāram*, in three words. And as to *caurayātanaṁ*, I am sure it represents a misreid *caura yātanaṁ*. I restore, accordingly, Somadeva's genuine śloka in this manner

tatas tadāpīrayogartu jīvitaṁ viśavedanāṁ

deham nishphalam āyāsam āhāram caura yātanaṁ

manyamanā,

= " considering life to be poison agony, the body fruitless toil and food to be a punishment "

- 39, 215 For *ājñānam gatam buddhīṁ savākchalam / sambhūyaya*
I propose *svavākchalam / sambhūyaya* = „guessing
that the king was gone after knowing her false tongue”,
buddhīṁ has the king for its subject, not the queen. T's
translation (I 366) is to be corrected in this way

- 41, 31 King Cātius the long lived, whose minister was the
wise Nagarjuna (see *supra*, p. 48), has anointed his
son Jivahira *yuvārāja*. When he rejoiced at his dignity
of crown prince, comes up to his mother she says to
him „Why do you rejoice without cause, my son, at
having obtained this dignity of crown prince, for this is
not a step to the attainment of the kingly dignity, not
even by the help of asceticism? For many crown princes,
sons of your father have died, and not one of them
has obtained the throne, they have all inherited dis-
pointment. For Nagarjuna has given this king an elixir,
by the help of which he is now in the eighth century
of his age.” These words of the mother, which I transcribe
from T (I, 377) = original text 41, 31—33, offer no
difficulty, but for the mention of asceticism. The life and
the business of a crown prince are the very contrary of
the life and the occupations of an ascetic. What, then,
the *tapas* has to do here? Nothing at all, I think. If the
śloka 31 were free from corruption, that *tapas* would
to be. I surmise, the genuine form of this śloka was

yauvarāṣyam idam prūpya putra hr̥ṣyaḥ kim mṛṣā?
rūpyapṛṣṭyaḥ kṛamo hy eṣa na kadācana vidyate
 = „do not rejoice at your being anointed crown prince
 this is never at all a step to the attaining of the royal
 dignity,” नकदाचन has been depraved into तपसाचन

- 44, 57 Sūryaprabha, the future lord of the Vidyādhara kidnaps many princesses as his wives, thanks to the favour of the Asura Maya. Roaming with his chariot through the air he took Mṛḍnasenā from Tāmraliptī, Candukāvātī from Aprānta, Varunasenā from Kūncī, Sulocanā from Lāvāṇika etc. From Tāmraliptī he carried away also a second prince's,

ayayan Tāmraliptim ca punas tatapy apūharat
aparām rajatanayam kanyam nāmnā Pīlāsiniṃ

Here I have corrected *apūharat* for *upūharat*, as is edited in both B₁ and D. Perhaps it was an error of print in B₁, thoughtlessly repeated in D. Cp. cl. 63, where the king of Tāmraliptī complains to the father of Sūryaprabhā *putrena tava me pahṛte sute* *Supra*, p. 71 we have conversely corrected *apa*° instead of *upa*°. At 48, 34 D has *upakṛtam*, which is preferable to B₁. *apakṛtam*.

Another instance of the same confusion is 75, 95. The woman says

kim tv aham na sadā tatra gacchāmy apahr̥tāmbarā
kuputrah kṛtato vastram dīpta hi harate mama

Here B₁ reads *upahr̥tāmbarā*, D *upahatāmbarā*. The fault escaped the attention of Boehtlingk, who in his *Chrestomathie*° p. 114 (cl. 37) kept the reading of B₁, Fawcett rightly translates, as if his text had *apahr̥ta*° „but I never go at present, as I have been deprived of my clothes, for my wicked son, who is a gambler, takes away my clothes, as soon as he sees them” (II, 236).

- 45, 27 In the answer of Maya, the advocate of Sūryaprabha, to Nārada, Indra's messenger, B₁'s corrupt text *yat ,prācīamedhākaranam deīāajūm” ca jalpatī | tad asat* has misled T (I, 415). D much better *yaś cācīamedhā*°. Read *yaś cācīamedhākaranam deīāajūm ca jalpatī tad asat* = „and with regards to his (Indra's) saying about the not-performance of an aśvamedha (by us) and our contempt of the devas, that is false”

19, 175 D = 176 B₁ For *sāpi tanmukha eva* I think it must be put *sāpi tanmukheṇ aiva*, *tanmukha eva* can not be accounted for grammatically, neither as nom nor as loc, and cp the preceding śloka *pravrajākamukheṇa*

216 „And a wife, [says Guṇarāman] who falls in love of her own accord with a man, is sure to be chaste, but if she is given away by her father against her will, she will be like Asokavati” (T I, 469) The original text of this sentence, whose meaning is exactly rendered by the words quoted, is thus edited

jyā ca śarasā rakṭā bhaved avyabhicārini
aiaṣā pitṛdattā ca syād Iṣokavati yathā

Here, I suppose, every Sanskritist must be at a loss how to account for *śarasā*. That word must be somehow corrupted, and I think we do not go much amiss by conjecturing the true reading to be *aiavaṣā*. The wife got against her will and given by her father — *aiaṣā pitṛdattā ca* — is contrasted with her who of her own accord comes to her husband, whom she loves — *śaiaṣā rakṭā*

53, 10

Labdhrāḍṭta, a dependent (*kārpatika*) of king Lakṣadatta, had received from his lord a citron filled with jewels. He, however, thinking it a common citron, sold it to some Buddhist mendicant, who visiting the king, presents him with it. Lakṣadatta, recognizing the fruit, asks the mendicant, how he came by it. The first line of śl 10 continues the question, B₁ differs here from D

B₁ *matulungam kuta idam samlabdham bhavatam iti*
D *mātulungam kuta idam bhadanta bhavatam iti*

I prefer the reading of D, but as it is very improbable that the king addresses that ordinary mendicant in so respectful terms as is implied by the plural *bhavatām*, I hold this word for a corruption and conjecture

matulungam kuta idam bhadanta bhanyatām iti
= „How did you come by that citron? Tell it me, reverend sir”

57, 111 foll. These two ślokas, in which the rescue of Sundarī from the well and the returning of her lover Iṣvaravarmān are narrated (T II, 7), seem to be badly transmitted in mss. Partly D, partly my own conjecturing may help

to improve the reading So I think, Somadeva composed them

utkṛipta mṛtakalpa i śi kṛtiatnananī nivedite 1)
pratyaḡate tamikputra alapam śanakair dadau ||
samaścāstum 2) samudaya īśtas tum sanuḡah priyūm
agud Iṣṭaiarīusau pratyauṛtyaua tadgrām ||

- 62 143 Since it is impossible to construe *yuyam* *saive*
hīṣṭantu and no other grammatical employment of the
 imperative is left then to be the predicate of *yuyam*,
tīṣṭantu must be a clerical error for *tīṣṭata*

- 63 59 The water genius relates how he has been born as such
 by a fault committed in a previous existence when being
 under the vow of the *uposana* he though not purposely
 had had sexual intercourse with his wife When this
 vow was almost completed' he saw, one of my wives
 wickedly came and slept in my bed (I II 82)
 Then happened that which is told in 41 59 defectively edi-
 ted in Br — one syllable is wanting — in D it is
 as follows

turye tu yame usurtya tadrate tanniveśanam
nidrumohat taya sukam ratam sevitan alam

It is plain that he did not forget *tanniveśanam* but *tan-
 nivedlananī* As to the confusion in ms between *i*
 and *dī* see *supra*, p. 69 at the bottom

- * 65 81 The meaning of *upakāśamṣa* as is edited in Br and
 D must be a mystery to the interpreters of this passage
 Somaprabhā has cured her brother to become a bird with
 a golden crest, and puts the term to the cure saying

When you fall in your bird form into a blind
 well and a certain merciful person draws you out and
 you do him a service in return then you shall be released
 from this curse I transcribe the words quoted from I II
 103 and I have italicized the equivalent of *taṣya kṛto-
 pakāśa* of the edited text to show that Turner
 translated *upakāśamṣa* as if it were simply *upakāśa* I
 surmise that the genuine reading is

taṣya kṛtopakāśatī tīṣṭati śepati elati tarījasi

- 67 72 Since there is no species of ruddy goose (*cahrai ika*)

) Br i vel i tam / pratyaḡata i an kṛ tram 1°

D i dī dī tam / pratyaḡat i ta kṛ tram a°

2) So D Br sa aṣ ast i

which is styled *niṣṭacakra-vāḥa*, and there is made mention in this śloka of the *caḥra-vāḥa* separated from his *caḥra-vāḥa* „at night” (I II, 129), a very common simile, the edited reading need be corrected into *niṣṭa caḥra-vāḥa* *sadrṣi kṛpya avastha mamābhavat*

- 71, 11 Migaukādittī has rescued the king of the Bhūllas from the peril of drowning, whereupon that prince shows his gratitude by offering him his friendship and assistance in his undertaking, inviting him to enjoy his hospitality with these words (I II, 154) „So do me the favour my lord, of coming to my palace, since I am your slave” It is obvious that the original text of this content thus edited

tat prasadam karuṇatā gṛhaṇ bhṛtyasya me prabho
must be corrected into *bhṛtyasya te prabho*

- 105 In the speech, with which king Vinḍakavī blames the inaction and the want of energy of his son Kama-līkavī, an instrumental has perchance ousted the legitimate locative from its place Read the first line of the śloka thus

tiayī ca dīpta nudyapī jṛṅga sukhasanginī

and translate up to the present time no longing for conquest has manifested itself in you, a person addicted to pleasures’ The edited text hīṣ *tiaya sukhasangina* is if *dīpta* were synonymous with *darṣita*

- 71 69 I suppose *pragalbhatē* to be corrupt We have to expect *pragalbhatam* The citizens thought (But) let Simira bhīṣ not dare to rob him of the kingdom ; The śloka, therefore, is to be corrected thus

maṇiṣya rāṅgam Samarabhatō hartum pragalbhatam etc

- 11 The man who was fastidious about beds one of the three fastidious brothers, bore a red mark on his side caused by a han that was found upon examination underneath seven mattresses This mark qualified in śl 11 *mudrā kutūlarūpa* is again spoken of in śl 11, for not *angam*, as has been edited, but *anḥam* must be meant It is said that the king was astonished on beholding that mark

so *‘py anīlasya vīkṣya tat*

tadrūpam tulikācangasyāṇḥ lam rāṅga vīkṣya
(I II, 273 translates „when the king saw the state of his body”) Cp Ksemendra telling the same tale IX, 2, 362

to improve the reading So, I think, Somadeva composed them

*utkṛipta mṛtalakṣmī sa kṛtūtmānam nivedite¹⁾
pratyāgāte canikputra ālūpam śanakair dadau ||
samaṣṭi astām²⁾ samādāya hr̥ṣṭas tum sānugah priya
āgād Iṣṭaraiarmāsau pratyavṛtyau tadgrham ||*

62, 143 Since it is impossible to construe *yuyā* *sa* *tisthantu*, and no other grammatical employment of *t*¹ imperative is left than to be the predicate of *yuyā tisthantu* must be a clerical error for *tisthata*

63, 59 The water genius relates how he has been born as *s* by a fault committed in a previous existence, when he was under the vow of the *upovāsa* he, though not purposed to have sexual intercourse with his wife „When the vow was almost completed’ he says, „one of my wickedly came and slept in my bed” (T II, 1. Then happened that which is told in śl 59 defective in Br — one syllable is wanting —, in 1 as follows

*turye tu yame vismṛtya tadrate tannivṛtan
nidramohat taya sukam ratam sevitan aha*

It is plain that he did not forget *tannivṛtanam nivedhanam* As to the confusion in mss b and dh see *supra*, p 69 at the bottom

65, 81 The meaning of *upakaramṣa*, as it is edited in D must be a mystery to the interpreters of the Somaprabhā has cursed her brother to become a golden crest, and puts this term to the end

When you fall in your bird form, as well and a certain merciful person draws you do him a service in return, then you shall from this curse I transcribe the words quote 105 and I have italicized the equivalent of *pakaramṣam* of the edited text, to show translated *upakaramṣa* as if it were simply surmise that the genuine reading is

lasya kṛtupakaram tiam śapam

67, 72 Since there is no species of ruddy ge

¹⁾ Br *nivedite tam | pratyāgāte canikputram a^o*

D *niveditau | pratyāgāte canikputram a^o*

²⁾ So D, Br *astāstī*

which is styled *niṣacakraṇavaka*, and there is made mention in this śloka of the *cal'raṇavaka* separated from his *cal'ra* *raṇi*, 'at night' (I II 129), a very common simile, the edited reading need be corrected into *niṣe cakrahia sadrṣi kāpya avastha mamabhavat* ;

- 71, 11 Mrgīṅkadatta has rescued the king of the Bhūllas from the peril of drowning, whereupon that prince shows his gratitude by offering him his friendship and assistance in his undertaking, inviting him to enjoy his hospitality with these words (I II, 154) "So do me the favour, my lord, of coming to my palace, since I am your slave" It is obvious that the original text of this content thus edited

taṭ prasadam kuruṣvahi grhaṇ bhṛtyasya me piāblo
must be corrected into *bhṛtyasya te piāblo*

- 105 In the speech with which king Vinudikura blames the inaction and the want of energy of his son Kuruṇikura an instrumental has perchance ousted the legitimate locative from its place Read the first line of the śloka thus

tiaya ca diṣṭa nidyapi jigīva sukhasaṅginī
and translate up to the present time no longing for conquest has manifested itself in you a person addicted to pleasures" The edited text has *tiaya sukhasaṅgina*, as if *diṣṭa* were synonymous with *darṣita*

- 74, 69 I suppose *pragalbhatē* to be corrupt We have to expect *pragalbhatam* The citizens thought (But) let Sumura bhṛta not dare to rob him of the kingdom, The śloka, therefore, is to be corrected thus

- 11 *marāṣya rajyam Samarabhaṭo lartuṁ pragalbha tam* etc
The man who was fastidious about beds one of the three fastidious brothers, bore a red mark on his side caused by a man that was found upon examination underneath seven mattresses This mark qualified in śl 41 *mudreṇa kutilarūpa* is again spoken of in śl 41, for not *angam*, as has been edited but *ankam* must be meant It is said that the king was astonished on beholding that mark

so 'py anīlasya vīkṣya taṭ

tadvṛpam tulikacangasyāṅkaṁ rajā vīkṣmīye
(I II, 273 translates "when the king saw the state of his body") Cp Ksemendra telling the same tale IX, 2, 362

ṣayyucango 'dhikas lebhyo yo, vālen ankītas tanau In the parallel place of the prose redaction of Vetālapan caviṃṣatī edited by Jivamanda Vidyāśīgarī in 1873 (title 5, p 27¹⁹) likewise *ṣayyucanēoh prāthe cūnam dīstīa brute , satyam ayam ṣayyucanēnh*"

- 83, 30 Jivādatta, one of the suitors for the hand of Anan giratī being asked his name and his profession or art, answers

*vipro 'Iam Jivādattakhyo vijñānam ca mānēdīṣam
jantun mrtan apy anyā darṣayamy aṣu jātāh*

So this śloka is edited Its meaning is plain, but for *apy anyā* That T's translation (II, 276) ; I can restore to life dead creatures, and exhibit them alive is materially right is out of question But T did as less understand the words *apy anyā* as I do I believe they are vitiated and perhaps we would not be far from the truth, if we restored *anupranya* like *anupranana*, in its most strict acceptance, signifies a certain ceremony in the ritual of the jatakarma the object of which is to vivify the newborn child by inspiring into it successively the five different breaths which constitute life In a figurative sense it is used in the Piabōdhacandrodāya IV (p 137 of ed Nirṇayas 1898) *pranayamadyanuprānanena* Here, too, the verb *anupranayati* would be apposite to express the idea of restoring to life dead people Cp *uṣṭasya hi prānānam jīvanam tve* (RV 1, 48, 10), in you (Uṣas) resides that which makes every being breathe and live

- 91, 100 The boy of seven years who willingly offers his life to save that of the king and to relieve his poor parents says to them, when he asks their permission permit me to do so, and put an end to your poverty (I II, 310) The Sanskrit original of this sentence is vitiated by a grammatical blunder, which I should pass over tacitly, for it seems to be a simple error of print in Br if not D had the same fault Of course, it must be

tan mām abhyanujantam hatam capadam ātmanah
both Br and D have *hatam*

- 95, 12 *tato dhīnu yīteṣu tīkṣṇasūryavīrusīyakāṇi
pravitīmanī niruddhadhēā glāmakāla ślabhyagāt*

The adverb *īha* is out of place This is so obvious that 'I (II, 313) omitted it in his translation unconsciously,

methinks Read *gharmakala ivabhyagat* the particle of comparison though put after *gharmakalah* logically belongs to *prostitum niruddhadhu*. The three following *çlokas* are built up in a similar way they are descriptive of characteristics of the hot season each truth being embellished by a comparison denoted by *na*. This consideration favours the proposed correction

- * 108, 131 The spies who have visited incognito the court of the rival Viçyadhara king Mandaradeva report to Narayaṇadatta the hostile intentions of that monarch and his disdaining utterance about him. On hearing this the assembly of V's partisans were all beside themselves with anger. The arms of Citrangada frequently waved and extended seemed with the tinkling of their bracelets to be demanding the signal for combat etc. (I II 136). What is said here of Citrangada corresponds to this *çloka*:

Citrangadasya bahu s au udh utapra stau punah

amugatum uadecan yoddhūṃ calayanāṃ śānāṃ

Anybody who reads these lines must be stricken by the impossibility of explaining *stau*. This pronoun is not only quite superfluous but is little as one would say in English. Citrangada's arms frequently waved etc. Somadeva have expressed himself in a similar way. I hold *stau* for corrupt and suggest that the good reading is *h/e*. C made strong movement with his arms in the air to give vent to his anger. As to the philological ground of this emendation cp 106-110 where B has *kheda clalat* but D the right reading *śeḍacclalat* (*supra* p. 69).

- 119 110 Muktiphaladhvaja says to his friend that the temple of Graṇi neu which they have descended is the place where he rescued formerly his beloved Padmarati from the injury of the Rakṣas. [116, 27 foll.] In 1's translation (II 156) his words are: Here I had my first interview with my beloved when she had been terrified by the Rakṣas etc. the original of which is

amutra Rakṣasāstrasta puriṣṭi saribhāṣṭi mayi

But *saribhāṣṭi mayi* cannot be the equivalent of 'I had my first interview with her'. On the other hand no meaning inherent to *saribhāṣṭi* befits the situation. I think *saribhāṣṭi* is a misread *saritaritā* which being restored

makes the meaning this „Here I rescued her, when she had been terrified by the Rākṣasīs ”

- 184 Padmāvatī is about to put an end to her hopeless life and deliberates, what means of suicide is the best in her case. The blazing funeral pile, which has consumed the bodies of Muktāphaladhīraja and Mahābuddhi does not like her, since „it is not fitting, that I should enter this fire and be mixed up with strange men. So in this (difficult conjuncture) hanging, which gives no trouble, is my best resource” (T II, 559). I have put within brackets two words added by the translator. The original Sanskrit śloka is this

*parapūruṣamādhye tu praveṣtum anale 'tra me
na yuktam tad anāyāsah pāṣa evātra me gaṭhi*

Should hanging be styled by that girl a manner of killing one's self „which gives no trouble”? And even if she thought so, this declaration is not the contrast of what precedes, as it ought to be, for it is *not on account of the trouble* which she fears that she is not willing to throw herself into the fire. In short, *anāyāsah* must be a corrupt reading, the genuine word hidden under the corruption is *anāsthāyāḥ*, I think. By restoring it, we get this meaning „hanging alone is the proper act for me, destitute as I am of hope’

- 121, 148 Śakra has cursed Kāvatī and added the term of the curse. She goes back to the earth and weeping „told to Thinthākarāla the curse Indra had pronounced, together with the end he had appointed to it, and how he himself was to blame” (T II, 579). Of the Sanskrit original of the quoted passage, as it is edited,

*ut Indraṣṭapaṣāpāntuḥ etya saṣruḥ ṣaṣamsa sa
tasmaḥ Kāvatī Thinthākarālāya saṁśyātām,*

the last word cannot be right. Read *saṁśyākām*, an *avayābhīva* = „with words of blame’

- 123, 266 B = 265 Br. The wicked servant who had in vain tried to keep the lady whom he had to lead to his master for himself, and now returns to him without her, exculpates himself with a lie. He says „no sooner did she come out and was seen, than I was seized there by those other men, etc.” (T II, 607). The words quoted represent nearly the meaning of the original text, but

in the editions the conjunctions *yūat* *tavat* have interchanged their places. It must be

nana sã nragād yāvād, dr̥ṣtas tāvad aham janāḥ
Br reads the line thus

nana sã nragāt tāvad dr̥ṣṭā, yāvād aham janāḥ
D as follows

nana sa nragāt tavād dr̥ṣṭo yāvād aham janāḥ

The meaning is, 'Before she had come out, other people saw me, those seized me and took away my mule'

124, 32 The style of the second line of this *çloka* would be much improved by correcting

ko nāma Vikramādityah? sa eva 'ājñām dadāti nah

(B1 and likewise D), into

ko nāma Vikramādityah sa yad ajñām dadati nah?

Care has been taken to offer only such emendations to the consideration of competent judges as are evident or almost evident to myself. I have avoided advancing uncertain guesses and vague conjectures. Many corrupt places are still waiting the hand that restores them to soundness, in the first place if possible, by the light of duly examined manuscripts, or this failing by critical acumen. For though, as stated before, the text has been upon the whole preserved tolerably well and *crucis interpretationis* are, therefore comparatively rare, now and then there exists a strong presumption of depravation being the cause of our want of understanding a given passage. Among others I mention 10, 63 11 16 14, 72 16, 55 22, 115 1) 37, 102 44, 107 53 85 (tempted without success by Kern) 55, 173 57, 17 72, 69 102, 111 112, 153

In the course of these researches comparison of Somadeva's text with the *Brh̥m* has sometimes proved a useful instrument in both exegetical and critical respect. I am persuaded that a thorough and close examination of both works in concordance with each other, as Mañikowski and Heitel have done already for the *Pancitantri* portion, must bear good fruit.

I will give a fair sample of what I mean with that help. It is worth while to deal with it more fully

*) Perhaps to read *kaṃ vyhen arjake jine** [= *arjane + jine*]. The reading of the editions *vyhen arjake jine* implies an impossibility. It is inadmissible to take *arjave* (uprightness) with the meaning of *jyū* 'upright'. Cf. also t 24, 79

In Somadevas t. 72 a remarkable story is told which may be called the very different Indian fashion of the legend of Daedalus and Icarus. The Sanskrit text that contains it, is edited as follows by Br

Āsīd Mālādharo nāma puṣṭam brāhmanaputrikah
 10 'paśyad ekadā Siddha kumāram iyoma gāminam 278
tat sparidhaya trīnamayān pakṣhān ābadhya pāṣiṇayoḥ,
utplutya 'utplutya gagane gaty abhyasam aśikṣata 279
pratyaḥ ca tatha kṛtsnān pariṣramam apāthakam
dadarīce sa kumārena kadācid iyoma cūrinā 280
, dhairya yuktān pariṣramya dushkrīḍe 'rthe 'pi sodyamah
, bālo 'yam anukampyo me, mama hy eṣa pariṣrahah,' 281
iti samcītya tushtena nīta tena sa śakṭitah
skandhena, divyaputro 'sāc ātmano 'nucarah kṛtāh 282

Truway, since he had no other instrument for interpretation at his disposal but the text as transcribed here acquitted himself well of his task by translating it as follows

Once on a time there was a young Brāhman of the name of Mālādhara he beheld one day a prince of the Siddhas flying through the air. Wishing to imitate him, he fastened to his sides wings of grass, and continually leaping up he tried to learn the art of flying in the air. And as he continued to make this useless attempt every day, he was at last seen by the prince while he was roaming through the air. And the prince thought "I ought to take pity on this boy who shews spirit in struggling earnestly to attain an impossible object, for it is my business to patronize such." Thereupon, being pleased, he took the Brāhman boy, by his magic power, on his shoulder and made him one of his followers." (T II, 154)

Here is its parallel in Bṛhka p. 254

ṣṣur Maladhara nama brahmano Dakṣinopathe
dadarīce nabhasa yuntam jantū Siddhakumārakam IX, 1, 532
tam drṣtvā tulapakṣubhyam kṛtsnatmanam parīkṣitam
akare gamanabhyasam yadhad utsahantibharah 533
tato yadicchaya yuto Bhagavan varado Guhah
tam dīṣṭvā bīṣakṣpayu cakura iyomagamīnam 534

Leaving aside a few slight differences between both narratives with Ksemendra it is not the young Siddha prince who pities the energetical fantastical man but the mighty son of Śiva himself. And considering more closely the tale told, it is much more likely that a god made him one of his followers than a simple Siddha *nucarah*, who for the rest may rather represent, some young Siddha

— Kṣ names him *Siddhakumāra* — than a „prince of the Siddhas” It is now plain that Brockhaus misunderstood the word *kumārena* çl 280 It denotes not „that prince of Siddhas” but *kumāra* = Guha = Skanda, the waigod And if we compare also D’s edition of the Kathāsaritsāgara, it appears that Br in çl 282 by mistake wrote *skandhena* [T’s „upon his shoulder”] for *Skandena*, as he will have found in his MSS So it is plain that Somadeva and Kṣemendra fully agree as to the main fact, that it was Skanda who took up the undertaking brahman to his dominions and made him his follower T’s translation is to be altered accordingly

CHAPTER IV

METRORUM CONSPECTUS

Somadeva was a skilled metrical man. He handles the most various metres with facility and does not seem to have had great trouble to harmonize his elocution with the severe exigencies of the different kinds of versified style. As a rule he writes with the same fluency and lucidity, whether he uses the ordinary anuṣṭubh śloka or composes gīṭhān and gaṇḍavikrīḍita stanzas. It is the old custom of Indian artful narrative poetry to change the metre in the last verses of the cantos. Somadeva, who in accordance with his predecessor Ksemendra composed the bulk of his poem in ordinary ślokas and made that metre the main metrical form of each of the 124 *tarangas* of his *sigara* of tales — the popular style and the literary character of the fairy stories being little adapted to more severe and more refined metrical schemes for the composition of whole cantos as is the case in the Buddhacarita and the classical epics of Kālidāsa, Viṅka and others — affords a comparatively large room to that metrical variety of the conclusions. In the first lambika he observed some restraint but gradually he must have allowed himself to indulge freely into his talent of displaying the richness of his descriptive and representing power in an elegant variety of metres. He does so especially in the last canto of each lambika. The ninth lambika ends with thirteen, the seventh with thirty-four, the long-twelfth even with forty-nine such free stanzas.

As I am not aware of a conspectus metrorum of the Kathaśaṅgarā already existing and this may be a useful instrument for further research I subjoin it here in the way of an appendix to these Studies ¹⁾

¹⁾ I follow D's text for the numbers of the verses in each taranga. Those of Br agree with them if the contrary is not stated.

CANACCHANDAS

Aṅga a) pathya

1 63—65 3 64 75—78 4 130 8 35—37 11 81—83
 12, 193 11 88 16 122 18 406 21 147 22 200—208 23
 91 21 230 20 292 293 26 91 273—278 (271—276^b) 286
 (281) 27 211 31 251 202 265 35 163 164 36 135 37
 238 239 244 38 106 107 39 240 43 245 202*) 208
 259 262 41 140 186 (187) 15 370 371 00 207 (208)
 210 (211) 51 220—220 52 405 406 53 32 194 54 210
 50 235—237 239 56 338 (339) repeated 358 (309) 417—419
 (118—120) 121—123 (122—124) 58 141 59 171 61 329
 61 162 163 60 250 256 66 192 67 114 68 72 73
 70 131 71 70 repeated 99 304 71 326 66 11 77 93—90
 80 51 82 48 49 01 02 83 62—67 86 164—170**) 96
 88 07—60 89 115 90 201—206 93 100 90 92 93 96
 15—00 98 32 99 11—47 100 44 18 101 374 370 100
 103 212 (211) 101 218 (219) 107 139 110 140 (116) 111
 101 112 211 113 90 116 90 118 193 194 119 193 201
 11 214 215 218 121 277 278 122 103 104 110 111
 123 339 (338) 121 58 Amount 171 stanzas

* In D with Br the stanza is a gīt but I s reading bad

** Vs 168 I follow Br whose read n^r I prefer in D that stanza s a gīt

b) gītā

23 89 90 21 53 231 20 207 26 140 (114) 117 (110)
 271 (269) 272 (270) 281 (282) 31 204 03 11 61 10
 223 43 212—244 246—201 203—200 200 261 263—118
 11 139 382—112 50 203 (204) 201 (200) 11 (11) 51
 227 52 110 50 360 (361) 57 170 177 59 118 110 60
 204 (250) 66 193 67 110 09 183 78 90—12) 81 111
 110 80 10 80 39 87 00 92 82 83 90 14—96 99 39
 13 07 58 100 08 101 392 103 218 (217)—221 (220) 213
 (242)—210 (214) 101 219 (220) 100 88 89 106 186 107
 130—198 108 207 (206) 109 116—118 110 111 (110) 116
 (147)—118 (119) 111 106 110 208—211 111 111—111
 116 91 117 60 66 170—181 119 191 199—202 219
 121 279 123 344 (313) 310 (311) 101 111 (212)—216 (217)

Amount 162 stanzas

*) Vs 4 s corrupt in D Br s text has here the right read n^r

) The bracketed ciphers mark the numbers of the verse in I r
) The s three gīt s are also d t n u bed by the relevant inner rh me

J

MĀTRACCHANDAS

Vartāliya 43, 257 56, 114, 415 (415, 416) 103, 215 (214)
Amount 4 stanzas

Upacchandasika

Somadeva has these three types

a) each pāda begins by ∪∪—

3, 79 4, 137 7, 112 10, 216 14, 90 32, 194, 195 (195,
196) 38, 160 45, 372 56, 120 (421) 57, 174 62, 236 237
64, 164 72, 405 92, 87 101, 389, 390 103, 201 (200)—209
(208) 211*) 106, 185¹ 112, 212 116, 91, 92 117, 171—174
Amount 36 stanzas

*) In Br, owing to a various reading vs 211 belongs to the type b)

b) each pāda begins by ∪∪∪∪

2, 82 14, 89 16, 123 20, 227 21, 145 25, 298 26, 270
(268) 34, 256 36, 133 59, 167 73, 440 102, 153 103, 210
(209) 109, 149, 150 116, 93 123, 340 (339) Amount 17 stanzas

c) both types mixed

34, 261 262 53, 197 72, 406 95, 97 99, 42 100, 59
103, 215 (214) Amount 8 stanzas In all of them one pāda
begins ∪∪∪∪, the other three ∪∪—

VRTTAM

Amṛtubh I a) *indravajrā* 32, 192 (193) 45 375—377, 379
48, 123, 125, 126 128, 136 59, 168, 169, 174,
175 72, 407 76, 42 88, 61 92, 84 86 99, 48—
50 52, 53, 55 103, 237 (236) 119, 198 Amount
27 stanzas

b) *upendravajra* 31, 257 101, 380 103, 232 (231),
235 (234) Amount 4 stanzas

c) *upajati* 4, 136 12, 195 25, 291 29, 198 199
45, 369, 378, 380, 381 48, 121, 122 124 127,
129—135 49, 249 (251) 250 (252) 50, 208 (209),
209 (210) 58, 139 59, 170 90, 207 92, 85 96 51
99, 51, 54, 56 101, 376—379, 386 103, 198—200
(197—199), 213 (212) 231 (230), 233 (232), 234
(233), 236 (235) 118, 195 119, 207, 209, 210 123,
311 (310), 342 (341) Amount 51 stanza

d) *śālini* 18, 107 25, 295 36, 131 37, 241 53,
195 84, 68 99, 46 (cp *supra*, p 138) 101, 391
110, 113 (114) Amount 9 stanzas

e) *rathoddhatā* 8, 38 15, 148 38, 159 45, 365—

367 46 249 70 130 119 194 195 Amount 10 stanzas

f) *svagata* 40 116 Amount 1 stanza

Īṣṭagā II a) *vaṇṇasthā* 12 194 13 195 32 193 (194) 31 219 38 158 50 206 (207) 53 196 54 241 58 140 59 176—178 101 382 383 103 197 (196) 212 (211) 222 (221) 223 (222) 225—230 (221—229) 106 183 119 197 122 112 Amount 27 stanzas
b) *indravāṇṇi* 119 205 206 216 Amount 3 stanzas

c) mixture of a) and b) 20 225 101 381 Amount 2 stanzas

d) *dīvataṭṭambita* 119 208 Amount 1 stanza

Īṣṭubh and jagatī mixed One stanza 103 236 (221)

Atyāgātī III *pīṭhasthā* 79 50 86 171 Amount 2 stanzas

Çakvānī IV *vasantīlaka* 1 60 2 83 5 141 6 166 7 111 113 13 194 15 149 16 121 17 170 18 105 20 226 228—230 21 246 23 57 88 92 93 21 229 (228) 25 290 26 282 (280) 283 (281) 287 (285) 285 (286) 27 208—210 28 193 29 196 137 30 142 143 31 95 96 32 191 (192) 196 (197) 33 217 34 248 250 253 255 259 260 261 35 159—162 37 212 213 38 161 39 247 41 60 42 221 43 275 46 246 217 48 119 120 49 247 (249) 248 (250) 252 (254) 50 205 (206*) 212 (213) 52 409 51 239 55 238 56 415 (413) 113 (414) 124 (425) 57 176 59 112 60 253 (254) 61 330 66 188 189 67 113 69 184 185 71 305 73 141 90 199 99 10 45 101 354 387 388 103 217 (216) 224 (223) 238—241 (237—240) 105 90 91 106 181 182 184 108 203 (205) 109 151 110 111 (142) 142 (143) 118 (149) 111 105 112 213 113 99 114 140 115 155 156 117 182 118 197 119 192 203 213 120 133 121 275 276 123 343 (342) 124 217 (218) 248 (249) Amount 122 stanzas

*) defect e n Br

Atyākavānī V *niṭṭhi* 2 81 5 140 6 165 22 259 26 279—281 (277—279) 29 191 195 33 216 34 217 16 248 47 121 48 138 49 251 (253) 67 112 74 325 98 75 110 138 (139) Amount 19 stanzas

Atyāstī VI a) *çāḍḍarī* 9 90 10 217 17 171 22 251 37

240 40, 116 41, 184 (185) 45, 368 102, 152
Amount 9 stanzas

b) *prthvi* 19, 118 21, 148 28, 189 190 30, 144
31, 258 41, 187 (189) 45, 364, 413 47, 120 52,
408 51, 235 53, 233 234 69, 182 70, 132 100, 57
109 152 113, 100 118, 196 Amount 20 stanzas

c) *mandākrantā* 23, 91 26, 285 (283) 42, 225
61, 161 66, 190 110, 140 (141) Amount 6 stanzas

Atidhrti VII *śardūlavikrīḍita* 6, 167 13, 196 21, 228¹⁾
(227), 232 (231) 25, 290, 294 26, 289 (287) 28,
191, 192 43, 256 44, 159, 160, 185 (186) 45, 373,
374 48, 137 52, 407 56, 416 (417) 59, 31 63, 195
66 191 71, 303 75, 196¹⁾ 78, 132 ~83, 39 91, 61
91, 137 97, 45 99, 11 103, 214 (213) 101, 217
(218) 108, 208 (207) 110, 139 (110) 119, 196, 212,
217 120, 132 121, 280 124, 249 (250), 250 (251)
Amount 40 stanzas

Prakṛti VIII *śiagdhara* 21, 233 (232) One stanza

Moreover there are two stanzas in Pāṇini 55, 125 and 126 They are composed in āryā metre The second is a *giti* it is uncertain to what variety the first belongs, owing to the uncertainty of the text

The total sum of these variously versified stanzas is 761 All other verses are anuṣṭubh ślokas As the whole number of the verses of the Kathasaritsāgara is 21388, it appears that about $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ of them are composed in other metres than the ordinary epic śloka As a rule the artful versification displays itself at the end of the tawngas, but now and then such stanzas are met with amid the anuṣṭubhs, the course of which they underbreak, yet this is done sparingly and always for some good reason,

The list of the metres used shows also that the poet betrays his moderation in this as he does in other respects Though he was able to give samples of a greater metrical richness and variety, he limited himself to the most frequent types He had apparently a predilection for the *giti* form of the *arya* and for the *rasaśatātīlaka*, the latter of which he likes to employ for resuming the result of the events narrated on the *monale de la fable* his use of *śardūlavikrīḍita* and *prthvi* is also relatively frequent He must have avoided the *śiagdhara*, employed but once, and the *harini*, of which no instance at all is met with in his poem

¹⁾ It is much for the credit of their author, that this stanza and the five next to it, each being the last of a tawnga, are śardūlavikrīḍitas of quite the same content but of various expression, built as easily and fluently as ever

Index of notable Sanskrit words

As the words making up the list of p 76—87 are put
in alphabetical order they are not included here

		page		page
<i>anaya</i>	22	32	<i>nibhulayati</i>	129
<i>apalapana</i>		53	<i>niyama</i>	100
<i>°apasala</i>		161	<i>nirakṣmi</i>	156 157
<i>aṣakṣa</i>		73	<i>nirpratibhāna</i>	157
<i>uṣaya</i>		53	<i>pathas</i>	111
<i>utphalati</i>		144	<i>paravatakkṛto</i> (Pūṣṭi)	30
<i>udghata</i>		131	<i>parvana</i>	53
<i>upahastaya</i> etc, confound ded with <i>upahan°</i>		160	<i>blāṣa</i>	9
root <i>ubh</i>		77	<i>māda</i>	104
<i>auṣṭya</i>	22	31	<i>maṛa</i>	147
<i>kāniratha</i>		137	<i>Mihirapya</i>	37
<i>kalatra</i>	53	note	<i>murkhakṛtās</i>	17 18
<i>kāyamaṣa</i>		23	<i>mecaka</i>	66
<i>kālapuṣa</i>		126	<i>yad astu</i>	66
<i>gaganangana</i>		113	<i>yad bhavatu</i>	
<i>gatudhran</i>		159	<i>yad bhavatu</i>	
<i>galla</i> (= <i>ganda</i>)		128	<i>yad nullattim</i>	53
<i>ghuka</i>		26	<i>ruddhaka</i>	55
<i>ciranti</i> (= <i>cuayanti</i>)		50	<i>rāpaka</i>	11 59
<i>chayādvitiya</i>		39	<i>lambaka</i>	
<i>°juni</i>		129	<i>lambhaka</i>	161 162
<i>tumbula</i>		49	<i>aram</i> used as a particle	
<i>dinura</i>		55	<i>°iega</i> Names ending in —	108
<i>drdlayati</i> — <i>dradlayati</i>		88	<i>śalabāṅga</i>	10
<i>°dr̥van</i>		69	<i>sabralmacrim</i>	72 note 110
<i>na param</i> <i>yavat</i>		73	<i>samaya</i>	100
<i>na nūti sma</i>	66	110	<i>sammada</i>	102
<i>nangvī anarata</i>		110	<i>Suklāti</i>	20
			<i>keṇuki</i>	66

index of passages quoted from other Sanskrit texts than
Kathāsaritsāgara and Bṛhatkathāmañjarī

	page
Avadānaçataka	I, 48 ¹⁰ 157
	189 ⁷ 87
	228 ¹⁵ 85
Ksemendra: <i>Aucilyavicāracarcā</i> çl. 7	23 note
The (Pāli) Jātaka	I, 266 ¹⁴ 87
Jātakamālā	VI, 27..... 159
	p. 221 ¹⁵ 182
Āntrākhyāyika (éd. Hertel)	I, 56..... 51
Ḍaçakumāracarita	Uttarakh., IV th Uçchv..... 161
Divyāvadāna	p. 633 ²⁵ 157
Pāṇini	III, 2, 13..... 78
Prabodhacandrodaya	V, st. 28..... 88
Mudrārākṣasa	I, st. 15 *..... 54 n.
	III, at the beginning..... 131
	IV, p. 179 (éd. Trimbak Telang)..... 51
	bharatavākya..... 52, 53
	I, 63, 4..... 77
	IV, 1, 15..... 77
	IV, 19, 4..... 77
Varāhamihira: <i>Yogayātrā</i> 7, 14 *	85
Çlokasamgraha of the Bṛhatkathā, and judgment about it.	{ 41—43 and 56—59

The asterisks point out places critically treated